

gram of legislation asked by the American Legion of the Sixty-seventh Congress in the interest of disabled veterans of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

518. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petitions of citizens of Cambridge, Mass., and citizens of the eighth Massachusetts district, favoring the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

519. Also, petition of Bay State Division, No. 413, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring the repeal of the excess-profits tax, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

520. Also, petition of Sons of Veterans Club of Massachusetts indorsing H. R. 2882; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

521. By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Petition of the Women's Auxiliary Post, No. 79, Weymouth, Mass.; the Dedham Post, No. 18, Dedham, Mass.; the Brockton Post, No. 35, Brockton, Mass., and the Norwood Post, No. 70, Norwood, Mass., all of the American Legion, favoring relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

522. By Mr. FUNK: Petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Pontiac, Ill., urging the passage of the bill for the relief of disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

523. By Mr. KENNEDY: Resolution of Winona Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring passage of House bill 7, the Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

527. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Austin Nichols & Co., food products, New York City, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 2888; to the Committee on Agriculture.

528. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of the Greenwald Packing Co., Baltimore, opposing House bills 232 and 14, and the Maryland Glass Corporation, Glass Container Association, Buck Glass Co., and Columbia Specialty Co., all of Baltimore, relating to House bill 4981; to the Committee on Agriculture.

529. Also, petitions of the Grand Lodge of Maryland and Miss Elizabeth Rumpf, both of Baltimore, favoring House bill 7; to the Committee on Education.

530. Also, resolutions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Maryland, Baltimore, opposing any attempt to repeal the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

531. Also, petition of Oscar A. Ferguson, Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 172; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

532. Also, petition of Miss Rose V. Quinn, Baltimore, favoring Irish recognition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

533. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Patrick Henry Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Niagara Falls, N. Y., urging freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

534. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of organizations of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and Ukrainian residents of Stamford, Conn., praying that the Government of the United States recognize East Galicia, along with northern Bukowina, as an independent State, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

535. By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of Johnstown Post, American Legion, No. 254, E. J. Higgins, commander, for relief of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

536. By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of over 1,000 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging amendment to the Volstead Act for the manufacture of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. By Mr. PARKER of New York: Petition of citizens of New York, favoring reduction of taxes on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

538. By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of citizens of the eleventh district of the State of New York, urging that Congress recognize the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

539. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of the Women's Auxiliary, American Legion Post, No. 208, Convoy, Ohio, urging legislation in behalf of soldiers' relief; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

540. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Celtic Association, of Boston, Mass., urging legislation that will assure American ships the right of free passage of toll through the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

541. Also, petition of citizens of Boston, Mass., and over 1,000 citizens of Roslindale and Forest Hills, Mass., urging recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

542. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Robert P. Vall, Decatur, Ill., protesting against House bill 156; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 7, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our father's God, and on the eve of what is nationally known as Mothers' Day, we bless Thee as our mothers' God. We thank Thee for these hallowed influences which have been following us through the years, for those sacred moments we recall when we learned our first lessons of truth and duty at our mother's knee and learned, too, our first evening prayer, and lisped Thy name as she taught us. We pray for the mothers of our land. We pray for our homes, that out of those homes new inspiration shall go forth and give to us a larger patriotism and a greater sense of devotion to Thee and to the interests which bind us to Thee and to Thy throne. We ask in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, May 4, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," the Chair appoints the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. SHIELDS, as a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GERRY.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I beg leave to present Senate joint resolution No. 26 of the Legislature of the State of California relative to immigration and particularly oriental immigration. I ask that it be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION,  
Senate Chamber, April 27, 1921,

To the President of the United States, the honorable Secretary of State of the United States, and to each of California's Senators and Representatives in Congress:

Pursuant to the provisions of senate joint resolution No. 26, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-fourth session, I am sending you herewith a copy thereof, reading as follows:

Chapter 36, senate joint resolution 26, relative to immigration.

Whereas the Japanese Exclusion League of California, representing officially such organizations as the American Legion, War Veterans, Native Sons and Native Daughters of the Golden West, State Federation of Women's Clubs, State Federation of Labor, and various other patriotic, civic, and fraternal bodies, have adopted a statement of policy recommended for adoption by the Government of the United States as urgently required in protection of the Nation's interest against the growing menace of Japanese immigration and colonization; and

Whereas said declaration of principles has been approved by the organizations affiliated with the league—the Los Angeles County Anti-Asiatic Association and the Japanese Exclusion League of Washington; and

Whereas said declaration of principles is in words and figures as follows, to wit:

First. Absolute exclusion for the future of all Japanese immigration not only male but female, and not only laborers, skilled and unskilled, but "farmers" and men of small trades and professions, as recommended by Theodore Roosevelt.

Permission for temporary residence only for tourists, students, artists, commercial men, teachers, etc.

Second. Such exclusion to be enforced by United States officials, under United States laws and regulations, as done with immigration, admitted or excluded, from all other countries; and not, as at present, under an arrangement whereby control and regulation is surrendered by us to Japan.

Third. Compliance on the part of all departments of the Federal Government with the Constitution, and the abandonment of the threat or attempt to take advantage of certain phrasing of that document as to treaties, which it is claimed gives the treaty-making power authority to violate plain provisions of the Constitution in the following matters:

(a) To nullify State rights and State laws for control of lands and other matters plainly within the State's jurisdiction.

(b) To grant American citizenship to races of yellow color, which are made ineligible for such citizenship.

Fourth. For the Japanese legally entitled to residence in California, fair treatment, protection in property rights legally acquired, and the privilege of engaging in any business desired, except such as may be now or hereafter denied by law to all aliens, or to aliens ineligible to citizenship; and provided particularly that they may not hereafter buy or lease agricultural lands: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the senate and assembly, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California hereby indorses said declaration of principles and urges that the President, the Department of State, and the Congress of the United States adopt and observe the policy therein stated; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be, and she is hereby, directed to transmit copies of these resolutions to the President and the Secretary of State of the United States and to each of California's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

MARTIN C. MADSEN,  
Private Secretary to the Governor.  
FRANK C. JORDAN,  
Secretary of State.  
C. C. YOUNG,  
President of the Senate.  
HENRY W. WRIGHT,  
Speaker of the Assembly.

And hereby certify that the same was duly filed with the secretary of state on April 27, 1921.

GRACE S. STOERMER,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Also I present and ask that it be printed in the RECORD senate joint resolution No. 24 by the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the protection of the almond industry, and that it likewise be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SENATE,  
Sacramento, April 16, 1921.

*To the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to each member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to each member of the United States Tariff Commission, and to each of California's Senators and Representatives in Congress:*

Pursuant to the provisions of senate joint resolution No. 24, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-fourth session, I am sending you herewith a copy thereof, reading as follows:

Senate joint resolution 24, relative to the protection of the almond industry.

Whereas the production of almonds constitutes one of the basic industries of the State of California, which State has demonstrated that she is capable of producing almonds in sufficient quantities to meet all the demands of the United States;

Whereas in order to properly protect this industry a tariff on almonds which are principally imported from the cheap labor sections of Europe, Asia, and Africa is necessary if this industry shall not perish;

Whereas the present tariff on almonds is wholly inadequate for such protection: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the senate and assembly jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes Congress to provide such a tariff on imported almonds as will equalize the cost of production and marketing between the home grown and imported product; and be it further

*Resolved,* That California's Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, urged to use all honorable means to secure the adoption of such a tariff; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be, and she is hereby, instructed to forward copies of these resolutions to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to each member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to each member of the United States Tariff Commission, and to each of California's Senators and Representatives in Congress.

MARTIN C. MADSEN,  
Private Secretary to the Governor.  
FRANK C. JORDAN,  
Secretary of State.  
C. C. YOUNG,  
President of the Senate.  
HENRY W. WRIGHT,  
Speaker of the Assembly.

And hereby certify that the same was duly filed with the secretary of state on April 16, 1921.

GRACE S. STOERMER,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Also I beg leave to present and to have printed in the RECORD senate joint resolution No. 28, by the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a tariff on olives. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SENATE,  
Sacramento, April 16, 1921.

*To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress:*

Pursuant to the provisions of senate joint resolution No. 28, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-fourth session, I am sending you herewith a copy thereof, reading as follows:

Senate joint resolution 28, relative to a tariff on olives.

Whereas the olive industry is one of the great and important enterprises of this State and materially contributes to the upbuilding thereof; and

Whereas the rate of duties on olives should equalize the difference in cost of production between the United States and foreign countries; and

Whereas the continuation of the existing low rate of duty upon the importation of olives will seriously hamper and retard the growth and development of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to impose a tariff upon olives and olive products which shall be adequate to cover the difference in the cost of production of olives and olive products in the United States and foreign countries; and be it further

*Resolved,* That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they hereby are, urged and requested to use every honorable means to accomplish this object; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

MARTIN C. MADSEN,  
Private Secretary to the Governor.  
FRANK C. JORDAN,  
Secretary of State.  
C. C. YOUNG,  
President of the Senate.  
HENRY W. WRIGHT,  
Speaker of the Assembly.

And hereby certify that the same was duly filed with the secretary of state on April 16, 1921.

GRACE S. STOERMER,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, while on my feet I wish to give notice that hereafter I shall crave the indulgence of the Senate to discuss particularly the matter of immigration referred to in the resolutions which I have just submitted.

Mr. BROUSSARD presented a resolution of the Crescent City Branch, United States Civil Service Retirement Association, of New Orleans, La., favoring the enactment of legislation amending the civil service retirement act so as to increase the annuities; to decrease the contributions exacted of employees; granting annuities to employees who become disabled in the line of duty without regard to length of their term of service; making the retirement of employees who have served 30 years optional irrespective of their ages and granting such employees the maximum annuity on retirement, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also presented petitions of John R. Drackett, James J. Le Bout, John J. Greenwood, Linus J. Adams, Louis R. Blakemen, J. M. Huff, Lawrence Bonner, C. A. Blanchard, H. J. Bourgeois, C. C. Degrelle, and W. W. Breaux, all of Morgan City, La., praying for the enactment of legislation for the recognition of the Irish republic, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER present resolutions of the Woman's Auxilliary, American Legion, of Perry; Chamber of Commerce of Great Bend; Auxilliary to Russell Blackburn Post, American Legion, of Strong City; Kiwanis Club, of Lawrence; Woman's Auxilliary, American Legion, of McLouth; and American Legion Post, No. 78, of Cottonwood Falls, all in the State of Kansas, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Antelope Local, Farmers' Union, of Potter, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Americus, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax law and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented resolutions of the Kiwanis Club, of Bridgeport; Women's Auxilliary, Seicheprey Post, No. 2, of Bristol; Seicheprey Post, No. 2, American Legion, of Bristol; and Board of Education, of Waterbury, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of East Canaan Grange, No. 136, Patrons of Husbandry, of East Canaan, Conn., protesting against the enactment of a daylight saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the Woman's Club, of Norwalk, and the Mount Carmel Book Club, of Mount Carmel, both in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to commercialize the national parks, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the Norwich Central Labor Union, of Norwich, Conn., favoring the immediate resumption of trade with soviet Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Howard Bossa Post, No. 653, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of New Canaan, Conn., remonstrating against the conclusion of any peace treaty with Germany until Grover Cleveland Bergdoll is delivered to the American authorities, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the repeal of the Esch-Cummins Act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.



He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the amendment of the interstate commerce act, as amended by the transportation act of 1920, so as to restore to the States the control of the capital securities of all railroad corporations created under the sovereignty of the States and operating railroads wholly within the territorial limits thereof; the control by the States of intrastate rates over intrastate traffic, and the authority of the States to compel service by the railroads in the transportation of persons and property on the basis of a fair return upon the fair value of the used and useful property of the railroad company, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the amendment and modification of the so-called La Follette Act so as to alleviate restrictive and burdensome conditions relative to the operation of vessels upon the Great Lakes and connecting waters, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

[See yesterday's proceedings, page 1096, where the above resolutions appear when presented by Mr. TOWNSEND.]

#### REMOVAL OF SOLDIER DEAD FROM FRANCE.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, several days ago the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] had printed in the RECORD a communication from Rev. Richard D. Harlan, and also what purported to be a news item indicating the views of Mr. Owen Wister on the subject of bringing home the soldier dead. I have a letter this morning from the Bring Home the Soldier-Dead League of the Pittsburgh area, in which they take exceptions to many of the statements of fact made by Rev. Mr. Harlan and by Mr. Owen Wister. I ask permission to have the communication printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRING HOME THE SOLDIER-DEAD LEAGUE,  
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 4, 1921.

Hon. P. C. KNOX,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My attention has been directed to a letter addressed to Senator LODGE by the Rev. Richard D. Harlan, of New York City, dated April 15, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26; incorporated with this letter was a purported news item by Owen Wister.

The subject had to do with the Government's work in returning those soldier dead from foreign burial places whose next of kin have advised the War Department they desired such return for interment in the home land. Mr. Harlan writes in part:

There seems to be good reason for suspecting that some people connected with the undertaking profession are, for their own financial advantage, making merchandise of the natural desires of many of our American soldiers whose bodies are now resting in the American cemeteries.

As chairman of the Pittsburgh area of the "Bring Home the Soldier-Dead League of the United States," composed exclusively of about 1,000 parents and near kin of those dead whose bodies are desired returned to America, I want to brand this statement as not only untrue but a slur on every member of this league which has insisted that the Nation redeem its promise to us and to our sacrificed dead that, in case our loved ones gave their lives to their country, their bodies would be returned to us.

I have had some experience with the actions of undertakers who have had charge of funerals of some of these returned dead; in no case has there been any disposition to be extortionate; to the contrary, some have assumed a large part of the expense, saying that the little they could contribute in honoring these dead could not measure up to the sacrifices made by our heroic sons and brothers and husbands. Men in the undertaking business more nearly approach the depths of sorrow we mourners have than such as the Rev. Harlan and others, who dare to intrude themselves into our personal desires with their unsolicited and presumptuous opinions. Do these self-appointed arbiters expect us to heed their officious meddling into our sacred determination to have our loved dead? It is the height of impudence to infer, as this Harlan does, that the parents of nearly 45,000 of these soldier dead are not "thinking straight on this sacred subject." We are not supplicants to the Government for our dead; they were promised to us and the Nation has returned probably 16,000 by this time, and we have no fear that the work will not be completed and our sons be entombed in the home cemeteries where we may pay tribute of love and respect to their memories. This league has no fear that the Congress will fail to return our boys by providing ample appropriation for the purpose.

The letter of Owen Wister, addressed to the American Legion, under a Paris date line, is insulting to every parent of all soldier dead; none but a ghoul would have the effrontery to write and have printed where the eyes of a loving mother would read them the declarations he made, affecting, as his letter does, those bodies to be left in France as well as those to be brought to the United States. None but a tainted mind would conjure up the vision he has dared to; his province is fiction at its worst.

Regardless of the views of these self-appointed and notoriety-seeking intruders, we know the Government will redeem its promise to us parents; we know the sentiment of the Members of Congress too well by our pilgrimages to Washington, in behalf of our dead, to have any other thought but that all our dead will be returned to us during this year. We have no quarrel with those who want their loved ones to remain in France—these will be the hostages for help in the wars against that country in the years to come; let them remain there—but those of us who believe otherwise are determined that nothing this side of hell will prevent the fulfillment of America's sacred pledge to our dead and to us.

I am sure you will agree that our viewpoint has the same standing as that of Richard D. Harlan, and that space will be accorded us in the RECORD.

With best wishes, I remain, dear sir,

Very sincerely,

J. D. FOSTER,

Chairman Pittsburgh Area Bring Home  
the Soldier-Dead League of the United States.

#### EXCHANGE OF ARMS AND EQUIPMENT.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1574) authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange, with foreign nations desiring the same, samples of arms and equipment in use by the Army of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 38) thereon.

#### RELIEF OF WATER USERS ON IRRIGATION PROJECTS.

Mr. McNARY. From the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to furnish water to applicants and entrymen in arrears for more than one calendar year of payment for maintenance or construction charges, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 13, 1914. The joint resolution passed the House a few days ago, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the measure.

Mr. CURTIS. Let it be read before unanimous consent is granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The reading clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.* That in view of the financial stringency and the low price of agricultural products, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, after due investigation, to furnish irrigation water on the Federal irrigation projects during the irrigation season of 1921 to water-right applicants or entrymen who are in arrears for more than one calendar year for the payment of any charge for operation and maintenance, or any construction charges and penalties, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 13, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 686): *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to relieve any beneficiary hereunder from payments due or penalties thereon required by said act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I shall not object to its immediate consideration, but I hope the Senator from Oregon will explain to us who are not from States containing arid or semiarid lands what change of law will result from it.

Mr. McNARY. I can explain it to the Senator, as I had intended to do, in a very few words.

The reclamation act which was passed in 1902, with the terms of which the Senator is no doubt familiar, was amended in 1916, requiring water users to pay annually the water rates for maintenance and construction. The time fixed for the payment of maintenance was the 1st day of March of each year. This year the farmers on some of the irrigation projects were unable to pay the charge on account of inability to dispose of their farm products.

In the arid regions a great deal of land is used in the raising of alfalfa. On account of the low price of sheep and cattle hay has not moved and probably 3 per cent of the 40,000 water users are unable to meet these arrearages. It is not the purpose of the joint resolution to amend the act or any of the acts amendatory thereof, but to permit the Secretary of the Interior, after an investigation, to let the water users employ the water



this year in order that they may raise a crop, and in the fall they will be able to meet their delinquencies which have accrued this spring.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that it is wholly within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and is limited to this year. Is not that true?

Mr. McNARY. That is it exactly. It does not cancel any indebtedness to the United States, but simply gives the water users an opportunity to raise their crops this year. The water is available; it has been impounded—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to any Senator who may feel inclined to question the wisdom of this measure that, in the first place, it does not forgive any debt. The farmers on the new irrigation districts, like all other farmers, have had to meet a great loss. A few of them, and it does not apply to very many compared to the whole number, have been unable to pay under the law for the use of water.

It does not cost the Government anything. The Government simply postpones the payment of the debt until they can move the crops they have or until they can raise another crop. The water is there just the same, and if we do not let them use it, it will go to waste. So there can be, it seems to me, no question whatever, under all the circumstances, that the authority ought to be given to the Secretary to extend the time of payment. That is about all the joint resolution means.

Mr. McNARY. I tried to say as much as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said. In concluding I wish to state that this is the first time in the 18 years in which the irrigation has been practiced by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States where a similar request has been made. These projects have shown their ability to take care of all their charges, but on account of the peculiar situation which obtains throughout the country by reason of the dislocation of business it is necessary to enact this piece of emergency legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 1646) granting a pension to Maude Gillock;

A bill (S. 1647) granting a pension to Thomas W. Bath; and

A bill (S. 1648) granting a pension to J. E. Peters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1649) to provide for the disposal of certain waste and drainage water from the Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 1650) for the relief of Sam E. Harwell; and

A bill (S. 1651) for the relief of Prairie View State Normal and Industrial College, Prairie View, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 1652) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1653) providing for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern and southern districts of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Walter I. Whitty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 1655) for the relief of Orin Thornton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1656) for the relief of Grover Ashley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 1657) granting a pension to Ellen Knefler Taussig; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1658) to correct the military record of the officers and enlisted men of the Enrolled Missouri Militia and all other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion who served 90 days or more; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 1659) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Lovell, Wyo.;

A bill (S. 1660) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Greybull, Wyo.;

A bill (S. 1661) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Kemmerer, Wyo.;

A bill (S. 1662) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Wheatland, Wyo.;

A bill (S. 1663) to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Buffalo, Wyo.;

A bill (S. 1664) to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Cody, Wyo.;

A bill (S. 1665) to provide for the erection of a public building at Green River, Wyo.; and

A bill (S. 1666) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Powell, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 1667) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Waverly, Tenn., one German cannon or field-piece; and

A bill (S. 1668) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the town of McMinnville, Tenn., two condemned bronze or brass cannons or fieldpieces and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1669) to establish in the Treasury Department a veterans' bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act; to the Committee on Finance.

#### AMENDMENT TO EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the emergency tariff bill. On page 3, line 15, I move to amend by striking out the numeral "7" and inserting in lieu thereof "20," so as to read:

Cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or more in length, 20 cents per pound.

I shall avail myself of an early opportunity to submit some observations upon the subject. While it is very important and there is a vast deal of data on the matter I believe I can cover it in 10 minutes. I shall crave the indulgence of the Senate for 10 minutes on Monday to explain the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

#### CAPT. EDMUND G. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Naval Affairs is authorized and directed to investigate the facts leading to the court-martial as well as the court-martial proceedings, and all the findings in the case of former Capt. Edmund G. Chamberlain, United States Marine Corps, and report to Congress.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMITTEE.

Mr. BORAH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. McLEAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved*, That Rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph, as follows:

"6. Every bill and joint resolution which seeks to amend an existing law shall, when offered, definitely state the changes and additions proposed, and the law as it will read when amended."

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. HARRISON addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the morning hour having expired, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2435) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate com-



merce with foreign countries; to prevent dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I had intended this morning to take up and move the present consideration of the resolution heretofore submitted by me proposing to change the rules of the Senate by providing for open executive sessions of the Senate for the consideration of treaties and presidential nominations. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the majority, however, expressed a desire to be here when that resolution is taken up and to express himself in opposition to it. He is unable to be here this morning, and, consequently, I shall not press the resolution at this time. I am going to avail myself of this opportunity, however, to discuss the bill pending before the Senate, namely, the emergency tariff bill.

Of course, all one need do is to look at the empty seats upon the other side of the aisle to be convinced of the total lack of interest upon the part of Republican Senators in considering the proposed so-called emergency tariff legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator ought to make his remark concerning empty seats applicable to both sides of the Senate Chamber this morning. The fact is, however, that the Committee on Finance is in session and members of that committee are in attendance upon it. Had there been a roll call I should have stated that fact. The Committee on Commerce is also in session, and members of that committee are in attendance there.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and Democratic Senators are on the Finance and Commerce Committees as well as Republican Senators.

Mr. CURTIS. And they are in attendance upon the committees, too.

Mr. HARRISON. It is quite true that, since the new gag rule was adopted by the majority of taking so many more places on the committees than are accorded to the minority, the Republicans have many more Senators, of course, on the committees than we have; but, just scanning the Chamber, the number of Democratic Senators present is evidently from two to ten times greater than the number of Republican Senators.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I join with the Senator in regretting the absence of so many Senators from the Chamber, but if he will count the Senators present in the Chamber at this moment he will find that there are several more Republicans here than there are Democrats.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator can not count; that is why he makes that statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, let me ask the Senator to count them himself. If he wants the RECORD to show the truth and if he wants the people to believe the statement he has made, let him count the Senators present. He is educated; he is a mathematician; he knows how to count. I suggest that he count aloud and let the RECORD show the number on either side.

Mr. ASHURST. There are more Democrats present than Republicans, by three or four times, I think.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, after the Senator from Kansas made his statement and word was sent out into the Republican cloakroom the number on the other side has been augmented. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. Now, if the Senator will make another count, he will find the Republican Senators considerably in the majority.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, I call attention to the fact that a large number of Republican Senators are rushing into the Chamber.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will count the Democratic Senators that came in out of the cloakroom, he will find that there are more Democrats who came in than there were Republicans.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I note the statement of the Senator from Nebraska to my astonishment, for a larger number of Senators on the other side than on this side came rushing into the Chamber.

Mr. NORRIS. I observe that the Senator from Arkansas came in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will address the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Nebraska might have observed me retiring from the Chamber to attend a meeting of a committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Mississippi now yield to me before the Senator from Arkansas goes out?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator from Arkansas if he is not one of the Democratic Senators who just came in from the cloakroom?

Mr. ROBINSON. I was just attending an informal meeting of the subcommittee which the Senator from Nebraska appointed to make an investigation into the condition of the rice industry, and I started to return to an informal meeting of that subcommittee, if I may do so, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska, while he continues his very illuminating and valuable remarks.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield further—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the Senator that at the time the Senator first made his allusion to empty seats and between the time he made the allusion and now there were more Republican Senators in the Chamber than there were Democratic Senators, and the Senator who interrupted me and has gone out again was one of the Senators who came in from the Democratic cloakroom.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course there should be many more Republicans here than Democrats.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, and that is the reason why they are here.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to have seen so many rush in from the cloakroom when they heard sounded the clarion note, and I hope that more will come in from time to time as we lay bare the iniquities of the pending tariff proposal that is projected upon the Senate. Especially do I hope that the new Senators who became Members of the Senate on the 4th of March will stay here so that we may discuss the subject to some extent.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand the Senator is going to proceed with his discussion?

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to proceed with the discussion of the emergency tariff bill.

Mr. BORAH. Then the Senator is not going to discuss his resolution.

Mr. HARRISON. I made the statement immediately before the Senator came in that I intended to call up my resolution proposing to amend the rules, but the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] expressed a desire to be here and to oppose it, and word has come to me that the Senator from Massachusetts can not be present this morning, as he is not well. Therefore, I did not feel justified in pressing the motion in his absence. That is the only reason why I have not pressed it this morning. Is there something else the Senator desires to say?

Mr. BORAH. No. I was simply going to conduct myself according to which subject was before the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand.

Mr. President, it is a remarkable bill that is now before us and a most interesting debate is taking place in connection with its consideration. I do not know whether or not this measure has any champions among the majority members of the Senate. I read in this morning's paper a very illuminating statement issued by the chairman of the Finance Committee, who has made one of the two speeches that have been made by the majority on the pending bill.

As I remarked yesterday, I congratulate the majority side for their silence on this measure, because the more they discuss the bill and try to defend its provisions the more will the country condemn them for attempting to pass it. It should be silently ushered through, if possible. Your action reminds me of a funeral, anyway. It may be that this marks the death knell of the Republican Party. The statement of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], prepared by him



and issued to the country on yesterday and appearing in the morning papers, I now read. This is from the New York World. The Senator from Pennsylvania says:

My own opinion is that the American people are just now more concerned in getting revenues revised and taxes reduced and the sheriff retired to the background than they are in academic discussions of disarmament. They want a restoration of prosperity.

That is a remarkable statement to be made by one of the leaders of the Republican Party, and especially by the chairman of the committee that reported out this proposed legislation and who is one of the two champions or advocates of the measure upon the floor of the Senate, for the measure contradicts in every word, in every line, and in every clause the statement issued and the wish therein expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Finance. He says that the people are interested in having taxes revised and the burden of taxation reduced to them. This bill proposes to increase the taxes upon the people. How do Senators on the other side expect the country to have any confidence in their action when the chairman of the Finance Committee speaks for this bill one day and the next day utters such a statement to the people as that to which I have referred?

But such expressions are not confined to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance. The pending emergency tariff bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee of the other House by Representative YOUNG, of North Dakota. In the last session it was presented by Representative FORDNEY, of Michigan, a most charming and estimable gentleman, a man for whom I have the very highest respect, and association with whom is really most bewitching; but he has always advocated the highest kind of protection on everything. Indeed, it has been his proud boast that protection can not be put too high to suit him. So it was Mr. FORDNEY who introduced the bill at the last Congress and handled it upon the floor of the other House. However, by some strange legerdemain, at which the present Republican leadership are past masters, the policy was changed. That organization in the House took the bill away from Mr. FORDNEY and evidently said to Representative YOUNG, who comes from a farming State, "Let this measure bear your name."

However, mind you, that was not done until March of this year. Mr. YOUNG is on the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Here is a statement that he issued to the country on January 14 of this year, just a few weeks before he offered this bill. I do not know whether or not he was given authorship of the bill in order to soothe his apparently ruffled feelings and bring him back into line. I know what adepts the Republicans are, both in the other House and in the Senate, in smoothing out the differences within their party and bringing all kinds of elements together within the organization. They will stoop to unfathomable depths to accomplish that. However, here is what Representative YOUNG, the author of the pending bill, said to the American people in January:

It is time somebody put on the brakes. Here and now I serve notice I shall oppose any such duties as these witnesses are asking.

The witnesses to whom he referred were asking for high duties.

They are pleading, with crocodile tears in their eyes, for import duties ranging from 100 per cent to 400 per cent above the Payne-Aldrich rates. I am going to fight with all the power I have against this penalization of the consumer. The war is over, and the consuming public is asking why those prices also are not gone.

So says the author of this bill. He continued:

If we grant the rates most of these interests are seeking we will simply be licensing a continuation of profiteering, filling the pockets of the manufacturer, who gets the protection, with the involuntary contributions of the consumer.

So there is the author of the bill in the other House saying that the consumer must be considered; that he will oppose with all the power that he possesses increased tariff rates of from 100 to 400 per cent; and then we see the strange acrobatic performance of Mr. YOUNG introducing this bill at the instance of the Republican organization in the House and championing it, when every construction of it will impose additional burdens on the consuming millions of 100 to 1,000 per cent.

Strange ways you have of bringing your Republican brethren into line! You employ flattery or give a little supposed protection, so that deception might be practiced upon constituencies. And then the chairman of the committee of the Senate [Mr. PENROSE], as I have just stated, gives a statement to the country last night saying that taxes upon the consumers must be reduced!

What must the American people believe? How have you the right to ask them to have any confidence in you, when the author in the House and the Senator in charge of the measure in the Senate talk about reducing taxation, when in every page of the bill you propose to increase the taxes upon the people?

Here is what Mr. FORDNEY, then in charge of the bill, said at the last session of the Congress. He was not going to offer this measure this session. In his speech, he said:

This bill is intended only as a relief measure, an immediate relief measure. I hope at the extra session of Congress, which will undoubtedly be called very shortly after the 4th of March, to see the Congress substitute for this bill a relief measure to remain in effect while we are preparing and passing a scientific revision of our tariff laws. As I say, it is my hope that very shortly after the beginning of the extra session of Congress the Congress will adopt as a relief measure, to prevent great importations of foreign goods coming into this country before we can prepare a tariff bill, either the Payne or the Dingley tariff law as such relief measure.

He advocated not this legislation being introduced again and burdening the American people by its provisions but, as high a protectionist as he was—having boasted, as I say, that you could not get a tariff wall too high for him—he said that he believed we should pass as an emergency measure the rates in the Payne law or in the Dingley law until a scientific revision of the tariff could be considered and placed upon the statute books.

And so it is, Mr. President. Strange changes have taken place; but it is in keeping with the majority party leadership—changing not only on tariff measures but changing in foreign affairs every day.

Why, that suggestion brings to my mind the fact that here the other day we saw the Senate of the United States pass a resolution providing for a separate peace with Germany, deserting the Allies, with whom our boys fought side by side so gloriously—offering practically an insult to them—and then about the next day we see the United States tendering its good offices as a mediator to settle differences between Germany and the Allies—aye, between our enemy and our friends—acting, so to speak, as the compromise "fellow"; and then we see extended to us by the allied nations an invitation to join them in their council and on the Reparations Commission. Why, Mr. President, in view of our inglorious action one can hardly believe they offered it to us as a compliment. It was a left-handed international jab, a soft insult. It was rubbing it in on us to extend that invitation after we had deserted them by passing a joint resolution providing for a separate peace; and yet the Republican leadership of the present administration did not accept it in that spirit. They thought we were being complimented. They accepted it, and the morning papers tell us that President Harding has sent as his personal representative the new ambassador to the Court of St. James, a man who has criticized and condemned practically every policy of the last administration for six years. But it is amusing after your torrents of criticism—amounting almost to abuse—of the foreign policies of President Wilson and the last administration to see you now hour by hour accepting them as wise and necessary. Oh, you are out looking for the footprints of your predecessors, so that the shoes that are worn by those who now control the affairs of the Government can be placed in them. I am afraid you will find in a little while difficulty in finding a shoe large enough to fill it. But I am glad to see you opening your eyes and appreciating the position and the conditions that are confronting this country. It is, however, worse than an insult to them for the President to send there as its personal representative one whose views have conflicted so constantly with those of the Allies and who has so often criticized and, I might say, insulted the representatives of these nations. He is, of course, a most undesirable person to send and can not and will not represent the ideals of America.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NEW. If it will afford any relief to the distress of the Senator from Mississippi over that proposition, I should like to call his attention to a London dispatch of this morning which appears in the papers carrying the Associated Press reports, in which it speaks of a banquet held in London yesterday, at which Mr. Colby, the Secretary of State under the Wilson administration, spoke in most complimentary terms of the gentleman to whom the Senator has just made reference and against whom he directed a very caustic speech the other day. He spoke of him in the highest terms. He referred to the new American ambassador as "an accomplished and cultivated gentleman."

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I read that.

Mr. NEW. I thought it might afford the Senator's ruffled feelings some relief.

Mr. HARRISON. I read that this morning—that Bainbridge Colby, in speaking to some Britishers, had said that this man was a very accomplished and—he did not say "most suited and well fitted," I think; what was the other expression?



Mr. NEW. I quoted it with accuracy—"an accomplished and cultivated gentleman."

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; "accomplished and cultivated gentleman."

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HARRISON. One moment. That kind of a compliment reminds me, Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana should be told of the beauty and charm and attractiveness of some estimable lady, and he should speak of her charms in response and say, "Yes; she is a nice girl," I fear she would accept it only as a mild compliment; and so the most that Bainbridge Colby could say about this gentleman who has been designated to represent us in the high Court of St. James is that he is "an accomplished and cultivated gentleman." No one has ever said he was not accomplished. None has ever remarked that he was not cultivated. His being a gentleman has not been questioned.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, if I may ask both Senators a question, could it not be said of Lord Chesterfield and Aaron Burr alike that they were cultivated and accomplished? And if you will excuse treason, perfidy, or ingratitude, you may apply to all three the term "gentleman."

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is right. So there have been constant changes. Why, there was a change upon the part of the administration touching the Colombian treaty. There will be soon a change about the League of Nations. Of course, we did not know exactly what you were going to do touching the League of Nations from utterances in the last campaign, but you will gradually come to it. I am glad to see that the new Secretary of State is leading the Republican Party back "to normalcy," so that we will arrive at a state of normalcy on the League of Nations proposition. Of course, when it is done, it is going to arouse the ire of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and those irreconcilables in this country who allowed themselves to be deceived in the last campaign, but all of that will adjust itself. They, as well as the country, in time will appreciate its necessity. The sentiment in the country is growing stronger day by day, and it will grow stronger, until finally the present administration will be forced to accept almost in detail what the past administration has done in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

It would have been impossible for you to have changed front on more propositions and to have realized the wisdom of the policies of President Wilson in so short a time more than you have. As suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the present President has notified the Senate to keep hands off, so you must. Of course, you know there must be no Executive encroachments. You can not break with him. You must just let him have his way, and then you will come back to what you did a year or so ago, when all of you over there, except about 12, were for the ratification of the treaty with some reservations and some amendments. You will come to that in just a little while.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of this committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], in speaking the other day, said that the other side of the Chamber could not accept any amendments to this bill. He said, "We will not stand for it. If we do, it will degenerate into a general tariff bill." If the general tariff bill that is to be fostered by you and fastened upon the country is going to be worse than this, then the Lord knows what will be left of the people when you get through with them. "Degenerate into a general Republican tariff bill!" And so you know, Senators, you have the word of the chairman of the Finance Committee, that no amendments will be considered. You must take this bill just as it is prepared for you. Employing the same gag-rule tactics that has always blighted the history of the Republican Party.

But here are the real views of the Senator from Pennsylvania on this measure. I read from the Protectionist, a Republican organ, of February, 1921. Here is what it says:

PENROSE CHANGES FRONT.

The bill had hardly reached the Senate when the announcement came over from Philadelphia that Senator Penrose, chairman of the Committee on Finance, would run over to Washington for the purpose of opposing it.

You read it in the papers. It was flashed in big headlines everywhere that it was not satisfactory to Senator PENROSE; and the article goes further, and says:

He came in a special car, with nurses accompanying him, and opened headquarters in Wardman Park Inn, the largest hotel in the city. On the day the hearings began, Senator PENROSE set Congress by the ears with the declaration that he would give the measure his support. Politics unquestionably influenced this remarkable decision. The Senator desired first to keep peace in the Republican Party, as FORDNEY had wisely done in the House.

It may be that the way Mr. FORDNEY did it over there was to retire from the authorship of the bill and allow Mr. YOUNG, who had denounced high tariffs and espoused a reduction in the high cost of living, to become the author of the bill. The article continues:

Besides, he desired to hold in line for the next tariff bill the low tariff Republicans and the Democrats who are inclined to support this one. The Pennsylvania Senator knew, moreover, that the bill would stand little chance of enactment, and he was therefore the more willing to give it nominal support.

Yet one of the two speeches that has been made by the proponents of this legislation was made by the chairman of the committee, who at first opposed the bill, and came to Washington on a special train to exert his powerful influence against the measure.

Mr. President, the Washington Post is a splendid newspaper, a newspaper of powerful influence, considered now and has been since March 4, as the administration paper—the paper that represents the views of the administration on public questions that arise. Here is what that paper said about this bill in an editorial in January this year:

The truth is, the more this proposal is discussed, the weaker it becomes, for discussion emphasizes that it is an example of favoritism, that it is a movement tending to keep up the prices of necessities of life in order that the producers may be saved from financial loss.

Yet that paper which condemned the bill in such terms in those days, has since the 4th of March, in its editorials, come to espouse the passage of the emergency tariff bill. It is now a wise, a great constructive piece of legislation. So it looks as if there has been a complete change all around over there. How do you expect the country to be able to keep up with you, and your newspapers in your vacillating policies and your constant legislative and administrative acrobatic performances?

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has been faithful to the bill. He has remained by it from the beginning. Of course, he had to discuss the provision relating to wheat, because that affected him and his constituents more than any other proposition in the bill. But he was ready at all times to defend the wheat schedule in this bill, and has sponsored the proposition. Yet about 3 o'clock yesterday, when no one was here to speak, and you were going to press it for passage, and we asked you if no one on that side would defend the provisions of it, you heard what he said, that "We are not going to discuss it over here," meaning that the word had been sent down the line to Republicans to keep quiet, not to attempt to defend the provisions of this bill. He said in defense of that assertion that the agricultural rates of the bill had been sufficiently discussed at the last session, and alluded to the fact that I had discussed it pretty fully at that time. I am glad I did.

But he overlooked the fact that certain States in this country have a right to be heard through their Representatives in the United States Senate, that the men who are sent here by those States can not be bound hand and foot and gagged, even though they belong to the majority party; that they are not expected to follow the instructions of Republican leadership at all times, and remain quiet when the interests of their respective States are at stake.

He overlooked the fact that there are 17 new Members of the Senate here to-day, with as much right to express themselves touching legislation, to take care of their constituents by vote and voice, as those who have been here many years. Seventeen new Senators are in this body, and now part and parcel of it, who were not here when this bill was discussed at the last session. Yet the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] said that these distinguished men are expected to take the hook as handed to them and swallow it, without even being told some of the defenses of the measure, which they might take back to their people in explanation of their action.

So, Mr. President, I am not talking to those hardened sinners—of course, I am speaking about political sinners—who were here at the last session, because I know that no amount of logic, no appeal, could be made strong enough to melt their stone hearts. But I want to make my appeal to the distinguished Senators who were not here at that time.

I appeal to the new Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM]. He was not here then. Of course, he has not expressed himself touching this bill; neither have the Republican leadership told him or expressed anything which he might take back to his people as an excuse for voting for this infamous piece of legislation.

I appeal to the new Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON], who was not here last session.

The new Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] was not here.

I believe the new Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] came in just in time to vote upon the iniquitous proposition. But he was not permitted to hear the discussion of the bill, because at



that time he had not arrived. He is entitled to hear some explanation upon the part of the Republican leadership of the provisions and of the character of this bill.

The new Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] was not here.

The new Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] did not hear the discussion at that time.

The new Senator from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY] was not here.

The new Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON] was not here. Did the people in the great State of Colorado expect him to come here and, by bowing to gag rule, accept everything the Republican leadership handed to him? If he follows that policy, then, sir, mark the day, because it will not be far off, when the progressive electorate of Colorado will rise up and condemn that policy. They would not approve—indeed they had not heard the slogan of the Republican majority of the Senate, as expressed by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDREE] when he said:

The steam roller is prepared and ready, so get out of the way.

I do not see in the Senate Chamber now the new Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORRICK]. He was not here then. Perhaps, too, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] thinks that all he has to do is to tell his colleague from the sister State just to the south of his, "You vote this way. You need no explanation from me, but you vote this way. The word has gone out from PENROSE down, and has been accepted." Perhaps the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] knows exactly what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORRICK] will do under those circumstances. But I hope he will resent such reflections upon the independence of his action.

Then there is the new Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE]. It was not his pleasure to be here when all the injustices that are written in the pages of this bill, which place additional burdens on the consuming masses, were discussed. He is here now. He is entitled, and his people are entitled, to know the reasons why an attempt is made to force this measure upon them. If I were he, I would rise up and say to the Republican leadership, "I want you to show me before you can gag me and vote me for this proposition."

Then there is the new Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE]. He was not here at that time. What if he had told the people of California when he was a candidate before that progressive citizenship that he would allow a reactionary Republican leadership to compel him, without discussion, to accept this bill as prepared by them, without explanation or justification? Do you believe he could then have won the victory he did in that progressive Commonwealth?

Then there is the new Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD]. He was not here at that time, and he is told by the distinguished Senator in charge of this legislation that he has to accept this proposition. He is told, more than that, "that no amendments will be considered."

Then there is the new Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER] and the new Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS]. All of these distinguished new Senators are forced to accept this proposition and told that no amendment will be considered; that they must take it just as it is prepared for them. If I were a member of that party over there, I would not stand such gag-rule tactics. I would rise up in revolt and insurge, even if for only a few minutes, and break away from the bonds of parliamentary slavery with which this reactionary crowd are trying to bind the new organization of this body. But, sir, the longer you stay here the wiser you will become, and you will eventually lose confidence in the crowd who prepared this bill and now propose to gag you by compelling you without explanation to support it.

Mr. President, let me bring back to the attention of the Senate the years from 1912 to 1919. It was a great period. It is good to think about it. It was a time when our country blossomed in prosperity like the rose. As the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] knows, the railroads did not have enough freight cars to carry the wheat and the corn from the far western country to the market. The Representatives from his section were vying and competing with the Representatives from my section and from the East before the Interstate Commerce Commission to procure additional cars, so that the products of the farms and the output of the factories could find their way over the railroads to market.

Wages were higher. Farmers were receiving higher prices for their products, and business men greater profits than ever before in the history of the country. New farms were being cultivated; new fields were being opened up. Labor was thoroughly contented and happy. The tired workmen could leave their places of employment and go home in the afternoon in perfect happiness and bask in the association of their wives

and little ones. All of this was made possible by the wholesome legislation passed by the Democratic administration. There was prosperity and contentment in those days. There were no men out of employment. Employers were standing in line.

It is good to think about it. It was a time when every avenue of approach to the markets of the world was cleared, when every channel through which our trade and commerce might flow was opened up. Hundreds of agents from the various departments of the Government were sent into every foreign field to study trade conditions and to advise the industrial, commercial, and agricultural interests of America of the opportunities offered.

Every policy upon the part of the Government was adopted with a view to building up our export trade. Commercial agents were provided for by law. Commercial attachés were stationed at all our consular stations, as well as elsewhere throughout the world. National banks were permitted by law and encouraged to locate branch banks in foreign countries. Our great corporations, under the sanction of the war, were permitted to coordinate and to cooperate in order to obtain trade in foreign countries. Our merchant marine was given the greatest encouragement and millions of increased tonnage was provided that the products from our farms and factories sold to foreign purchasers might not be dependent for delivery upon foreign carriers. American diplomacy was lifted to a high standard and instructions went out to all our foreign representatives to perform every act that might bring the nations of the world into closer trade relations with us.

Why, sir, it was during this period that our exports increased from 1912 to 1920 approximately \$6,000,000,000. It was a period when the farmers received higher prices for their products, working men and women higher wages for their labor, and business men greater profits on their investments than ever before in the history of America.

Why, sir, during that period not only did the farmers increase their deposits in the banks, but they opened up new fields and added to their wealth through enormous increased valuation of their farms. Labor was never more employed, contented, and happy. Not only was he permitted during that period to receive such wages that he could in many instances lay some aside "for a rainy day," so to speak, but he was enabled under the wholesome and beneficent legislation passed by the party then controlling the Government, because of shorter hours of employment, to spend more time in his home with his wife and children.

Why, sir, during that period the hum of prosperity from every mill and factory could be heard from one end of the country to the other and the red flare from our furnaces lighted every corner of the heavens. Bank resources increased by the billions and the wealth of the resources of America reached a figure of which the wildest optimist never dreamed.

Thousands of employers stood in line awaiting their turn at the offices of employment bureaus to procure labor.

The representatives in this Chamber and in the House from the West and East, the North and South, were daily competing with each other in making appeals to the Interstate Commerce Commission for additional cars that the products of their respective sections might be transported to market.

Why, sir, during that period the country was basking in such a whirlpool of prosperity that a propaganda was set on foot to restrain such enormous profits from being made and so much wealth being accumulated.

But how different it is now. Beggars at almost every door. Tramps riding the blind baggage on every railroad train. Five million persons out of employment and unable to feed and clothe themselves and families. Wages in every calling have been cut and the cost of the necessities of life still high. Hundreds of mills and factories closed, shopkeepers going into bankruptcy, banks failing, and thousands upon thousands of empty box cars lying idle on sidetracks throughout the country. Our export trade is falling off, our ships are lying idle, the warehouses in every section are filled with the products of farm and factory, without value and no market in which to sell them. The present presents a dark and gloomy day to this once prosperous and contented people. And why is it? The answer is easy. In November, 1918, the prejudice of the majority of the American people was aroused because Republican leadership made them believe that President Wilson went too far in his appeal to the country for the election of a Democratic Congress. In that appeal he told the American people that in the great work of reconstruction following the war that he felt sure a Democratic House of Representatives and a Democratic Senate would cooperate with him, and that he would be able to carry out his policies to the best interests of the country. His appeal fell upon deaf ears and a Republican House of Representatives and a Republican Senate were inducted into office to criticize, hamper,



and embarrass him from the first day they took control to the last minute he left the White House. Every appeal he made to the Republican Congress in 1919 to meet conditions as they arose was turned down, and from the time he and his party met defeat in the congressional campaign in 1918 a well-organized and adroitly conducted propaganda of misrepresentations and faultfinding was carried on from one part of the country to the other. In the next campaign—the one of 1920—in campaign literature, campaign speeches, and their campaign textbook they promised the people if they would give them complete control of the Government they would make the tax burden lighter and reduce the high cost of living.

The high cost of living argument and promises made more votes for your candidates and did more to defeat the Democratic Party in November than any other one proposition that you advocated. And yet, with these promises still fresh in your minds and ringing in the ears of the electorate, the very first bill that your party forces through Congress as a part of the legislative program, in December of last year, was to increase the high cost of living as carried in this legislation.

You say that you are trying to help the farmers by imposing these additional and increased tariff rates. Then, if your theory is correct, that these increased rates will result in benefit to the American farmer, whatever benefits are to come to him must be borne by the consumers of the country who will be compelled to purchase the products upon which the tariff is levied in this measure.

There can be no question where we do not produce a sufficient amount of a given product that is needed for consumption in the United States, and are forced to import from abroad the difference in the amount of production and consumption in the United States, that whatever tariff is imposed will result in a benefit to those who produce or hold the product. But it is likewise true, sirs, that where we produce in the United States a surplus of a given product and we sell that surplus in foreign markets the tariff, no matter how large, will have no effect upon the price. The United States has almost grown to be a "world granary," a "world farm." There is hardly anything that is produced upon the American farm that we do not now produce more of than is needed for our home consumption and the sale of which surplus is dependent upon the markets of the world.

We export more wheat than we import. We export more corn than we import. And we export millions upon millions more bales of cotton than is imported.

But if the theories of the proponents of this legislation are true and the tariff rates are imposed as carried in the bill, then flour will be increased 20 per cent; rice, 2 cents a pound; meats will be increased 30 per cent; fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork will be increased 2 cents and 2½ cents a pound.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Mississippi is almost as sanguine as the Senator from North Dakota, it seems to me.

Mr. HARRISON. As sanguine? I am sanguine that it is going to increase the cost of living in this country.

Mr. McCORMICK. To the extent that the Senator has just indicated?

Mr. HARRISON. If what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and I take it the Senator from Illinois too, because he voted for it, believe is true, it will certainly increase the cost of living. If it does not add to the price of the product, there is no use imposing the tax, because what you say you are trying to do is to help the farmers of the country.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Illinois is not a chronic optimist or a chronic pessimist. He does not believe that the increase in prices or in the cost of living will be as great as the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from North Dakota have suggested.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Illinois—we can get together on this proposition. He represents one of the great cities of the country.

Mr. McCORMICK. We could get together, possibly, if there were none to disturb us.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, for a while no one will disturb us. The Senator's State has a great city, the second in the United States, and there are over a million consumers there. Does the Senator believe that the tariff on wheat and on corn and on frozen meats and on wool and on hides will increase those things to the farmers or live-stock men of the country?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator hopes that there may be some relief to the farmer, but, as he said a moment ago, he is not a chronic optimist. He is less sanguine than the Senator from North Dakota and less pessimistic than the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. To whatever extent it helps the farmers, is it not the opinion of the Senator that the consumers must pay it?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator hopes the middlemen will bear the burden. To that extent he is an optimist.

Mr. HARRISON. Before the Senator takes his seat may I propound another question? Then the Senator does not believe that any part of the tariff will come out of the consumer, from which tariff the farmers are going to get the benefit?

Mr. McCORMICK. Let the Senator hope. He would not venture a positive opinion.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator think any part of it will be paid by the consumers?

Mr. McCORMICK. No.

Mr. HARRISON. I will ask specifically about sugar. The 1 cent a pound tax on sugar certainly the consumers would have to pay. Does not the Senator think that? Does not the Senator think the 1 cent a pound on sugar will have to be paid by the consumers? It is pretty generally agreed by all Senators that that is true.

Mr. McCORMICK. It is agreed, perhaps, among the Senators from the sugar States.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] would agree to it.

Mr. McCORMICK. He is from a sugar State, like the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. No; the Senator from Mississippi is not from a sugar State. They are very sweet people down there, but there is no sugar there.

Mr. McCORMICK. I was mistaken on that point.

Mr. HARRISON. So the Senator does not know whether or not this will increase the price of sugar to the people?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator hopes not.

Mr. HARRISON. What does he think about frozen meats?

Mr. McCORMICK. He is not an expert on frozen meats.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I will proceed; and, as I stated before, if the contention of those who proposed this legislation is true, namely, that the amounts of the tariff on the products upon which the tariff is imposed will help to that extent the farmer, cotton goods will be increased by virtue of the provisions of this bill, as well as wool and woolen goods, in many instances over 500 per cent; sugar will be increased 1 cent a pound, butter 8 cents a pound, milk 2 cents a gallon and cream 5 cents a gallon, condensed milk 2 cents a pound. And just think of it, the tired workman and the poor old fellow who smokes to drive away his cares and bring back dreams of better days is forced to pay an additional tax that will increase the cost of his tobacco.

Hides that go into the shoes that are manufactured in this country are increased 15 per cent. I need not tell you that that will necessarily raise the already too high price of every pair of shoes that is purchased by the consumers of the country.

There are many other increases in the bill, every one of which is on the necessities of life.

So the Senators who have the matter in charge owe it to the Senate to discuss the provisions of this bill, and they owe it to the American people to explain and defend the consequences that will flow from its outrageous and indefensible tax levies.

There have been some changes in the bill, it is true, but there are no changes, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota, respecting the tariff rates imposed on importations. And the antidumping clause, the valuation feature, and the licensing provisions are intended to increase the rates and add to the burden of the consumers rather than to lessen them.

Every amendment that has been added to this bill since it passed the House and the Senate at the last session has tended to increase still more the rates on the consuming masses. Nothing has been added that would tend to relieve them in the slightest degree. The antidumping feature has been fully discussed in the very able and elaborate address by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. It was likewise ably discussed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and Senators on both sides of the aisle agree that so far as the antidumping feature of the bill is concerned it is intended under certain circumstances to increase the rates. The worst part about the antidumping proposition is that it is not confined to agricultural products, the subject proposed to be considered in the pending legislation, but it applies to every article included in the general tariff law. It leaves nothing out. It takes them all in, and in some instances, as was stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] in charge of the bill, the valuation feature and the antidumping feature might increase the tariff upon certain articles from 300 to 400 per cent.



So the bill is worse than it was before, and those few Democrats who supported it in the last Congress should remember that, whatever excuse for their action then, there is none now, in view of the antidumping provision and the valuation provision and the licensing provisions added to it.

The action of the majority party is very different from that of the minority party. Here you are burdening the consumers of the country by deceiving the farmer and trying to make him believe that you are giving him some great benefits through the provisions of this legislation. I will tell you what the farmer is interested in. He is interested in obtaining some loans from the farm loan banks. He is interested in having his land appraised on which he has made application for loan, and the application hastened for approval. During the last Congress helpful amendments to the farm loan act were offered from this side of the aisle. You will remember that when the case was pending in the Supreme Court wherein the farm loan system was attacked and its constitutionality assailed and no bonds could be sold, and all the agents and appraisers were laid off, and the offices closed, that it was from this side of the aisle that the suggestion was made that the Treasurer of the United States purchase \$100,000,000 of the bonds so that the system might be revived and the farmers obtain some of the benefits. You saw and I saw the other side of the aisle oppose it and cut it down to take care of only those applications which had been made and which had been approved. Then we saw later in the closing days of the last Congress the introduction of an amendment to one of the general appropriation bills authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to take over \$100,000,000 of the farm loan bank bonds. It passed the Senate, but it was stricken out either in the House or in conference and did not become a law. If that legislation had passed, there would not be as much trouble to-day among the farmers as there is. The responsibility for the failure to pass that amendment is upon you. Your leaders directed that it be eliminated.

Those applications for loans could have been taken care of, and that system would to-day be functioning if that amendment had prevailed. So those are some of the ways in which you could have helped the farmers, but you failed to do it. I saw, too, Senators on the other side of the aisle opposing an amendment to one of the general appropriation bills to appropriate \$100,000,000 to carry on the work of building good roads in cooperation with the States, and that legislation was defeated.

Mr. President, if the antidumping clause in this bill prevails, it will undo the work which this side of the Chamber did in 1913. The Senator from Wisconsin remembers that, because he voted for the legislation and championed it over on the other side of the aisle. Under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who was then the leader of the majority in the House of Representatives, we saw the condition of the farmers of the country; we knew that the great burdens upon them were caused in part by the fact that they had to pay too high prices for the things which they needed in order to work and produce their crops. While everything they produced was sold in the open competition of the world, practically speaking, on everything they bought—fertilizers, farming implements, and so forth—they had to pay a high protective tariff. So we wanted to relieve that situation, and we passed what was known as the farmers' free list bill. The articles that we placed upon the free list at that time in order to help the farmers of the country are still on the free list due to that legislation, removed from any tax and any tribute to certain overgrown protected interests. If the antidumping clause of the pending bill prevails, it may, if the circumstances arise—and the probabilities are they will arise—take from the free list every one of those articles and impose a tariff or a tax upon them, thereby increasing the costs of these necessary farming articles to the farmers of America.

Sirs, let me just cite to you some of the things that are embraced in that free-list schedule which really helped the farmers of the country. I see first in order antitoxins to cure the children from attacks of diphtheria. If the antidumping provision of the bill prevails, the time may come when there would be imposed a protective tariff against the mothers of the land buying at a reasonable price antitoxin and other medicines to relieve the suffering and cure the sickness of their children. Next, Bibles are on the free list, but if this provision in the pending bill should prevail it might be, if the circumstances should arise, that even those who desire to purchase a Bible made abroad and imported into the United States would have to pay a higher price for it. You want to prevent the sick from being cured and the godless from being Christianized.

Fertilizers of every kind, including Chilean nitrates, are now on the free list, but under the pending bill the time may come and circumstances may arise that a tax be imposed making the

farmer's fertilizers cost him more. That brings to my mind the fact that, with the exception of about eight real friends of the farmers on the other side of the aisle, Republican Senators in the last Congress defeated legislation that proposed to give to the farmers cheaper fertilizers, to be manufactured at the Muscle Shoals plant. So it is a peculiar and strange thing to me that the men should now pose as friends of the American farmer who have fought him throughout in every contest. While they pretend to help him in the pending bill, they are really taking away from him some of the advantages that are given to him in the free-list schedule of the Underwood-Simmons tariff law.

Under the farmers' free list we provided that cotton bagging, that barbed-wire fencing, that plows, that disk harrows, that harvesters, that reapers, that agricultural drills, that mowers, that horserakes, that cultivators, that thrashing machines, that cotton gins, that machinery used in the manufacture of sugar, that wagons, that carts, that sewing machines and needles should come in free. I notice that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] proposed an amendment in the last Congress to put a tariff on needles. They are carried in this free-list schedule because, if we could, we wanted to help the housewife, the farmer's wife, the consumers of the country, to purchase such articles at reasonable prices.

Mr. MOSES. May I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the needles which I wished to protect were needles that were used in machinery in hosiery factories and not needles that are used by the housewife?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; needles that are made up in New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. They are, indeed.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. We did not stop in this enumeration by naming the commodities that the farmer needed upon his farm in order to produce his crops, but we made the language so broad that it provided that agricultural products of every kind should be admitted into the country free of any import duty; yet if the pending bill passes in its present form, with the antidumping clause inserted, the result would be to increase prices to the farmers of the country. While proposing to help them, in one instance by imposing a high tariff on farm products, through the antidumping clause there would be levied high taxes upon the things that are now on the free list, and which are necessary to the farmer to produce his crops.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator from Mississippi mean that the imposition of a tariff upon farm products is going to be any detriment to the farmers themselves?

Mr. HARRISON. I am not surprised at the Senator from New Hampshire asking me that question. The Senator from New Hampshire can not understand how if the farmer had to pay a tax at the customhouse—

Mr. MOSES. Upon the products which he himself raises?

Mr. HARRISON. On agricultural implements, it would hurt him.

Mr. MOSES. "Agricultural products" is, what the Senator from Mississippi said.

Mr. HARRISON. On agricultural implements of every kind.

Mr. MOSES. No; "agricultural products" is what the Senator said.

Mr. HARRISON. If I said "products," I was mistaken, because I have talked for the last half hour on agricultural implements that are now on the free list, and which under the antidumping provision of the pending bill may be greatly taxed.

Mr. MOSES. I thought, if I may quote the words of Beaconsfield speaking to Gladstone, that the Senator was "intoxicated with the exuberance of his own vocabulary."

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad I have detained the Senator in the Chamber long enough for him to hear at least a part of my vocabulary, because the Senator from New Hampshire made one of the most eloquent speeches during the last Congress that I have ever listened to respecting the provisions of this bill. It was a speech which was published in all the papers of the country, and while it did not have much effect upon the majority side of the aisle, it was certainly filled with eloquence and great logic. It showed that the Senator is a real statesman, and that he is not willing because needles are manufactured in his State to swallow all other indefensible propositions that might be handed to him in order to get protection on them. I should like to read that speech.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, before the Senator reads it, will he allow me to interrupt him?



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HARRISON. I can not yield now; I will yield in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to read from the great speech that was made in the last Congress by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], which is found on page 3252 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1921. In speaking of the emergency tariff bill then pending before Congress, which was similar to the pending bill, the Senator from New Hampshire said:

Mr. President, this bill having been described to meet an emergency, the emergency is presented to the Senate in a most one-sided manner. I insist, as an all-around protectionist along the lines stated by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], that if an emergency exists with reference to American industry and trade, it exists in all branches as well as in the few which have been singled out for special favor, and that we, as national legislators, should consider all of them. The proposal which I make in the amendment now pending is to apply, during the 10 months in which the pending bill purposes to operate, all of the duties contained in the last Republican tariff measure which was adopted, a tariff which was amply protective for every industry which it touched, a tariff which was proclaimed to the country as the best tariff measure ever drawn, a tariff measure which was framed, in part at least, and voted for and upheld by 14 Senators still remaining on this side of the aisle, who can not have forgotten the panegyrics with which they covered that measure, and to whom I now appeal to give us, in the 10 months through which the pending bill purposes to operate, a complete wall of tariff protection for all industries, behind which the Congress may proceed leisurely and scientifically to draw a tariff bill fitted to all emergencies and which may be permanent law during many years to come.

I am trying to make an appeal to my protectionist brethren on this side of the aisle to support it, because it can not be that the measure now before us in the form in which it now stands, and to which I can never give my vote, can be adequately defended by anybody. It is regarded very generally as a measure which is indefensible. Private conversation among Senators shows that to be the fact. It has been admitted almost in terms by Senators who have spoken in its favor upon the floor. It is a bill—

That is this bill—

that grows out of an unwise yielding to pressure which was applied at the other end of the Capitol. It is the offspring of a union between the cotton field, the sugar-cane brake, the rice paddy of one section of the country, and the sheep run, the cattle range, and the wheat field of another section. It is a misshapen brat at best. It is lopsided, it is blind, it is deaf, it is bandy-legged, and it suffers from congenital economic rickets. It is misconceived, haphazard, and, to complete the characterization, ditch delivered. Republican Senators can not go to the country upon such a proposition.

That is the best speech the Senator ever made.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I am glad that my periods have fallen so pleasantly on the ear of the Senator from Mississippi, and I can only wish that upon the original delivery of the speech I could have delivered it with the force which he has now given to my restrained words in dealing with this measure.

I assume, Mr. President, that the Senator is endeavoring to wring from me some sort of recantation; that he wishes me to state that I have changed my opinion about the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I do not think the Senator ever changes his opinion.

Mr. MOSES. I have no intention of changing my opinion on this measure; I have no intention of voting for it; and I hope before the debate upon it closes that I may have the opportunity to offer once more a few well-chosen and wholly restrained comments upon what I believe to be its main features, particularly the last sections of the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very sure the Senator will make a most eloquent speech.

The pending bill is supposed to be a general bill to take care of every industry in the country, so far as the agricultural interests are concerned. Word has gone out that it can not be amended.

This bill provides that cotton with a staple of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches shall carry a tariff of 7 cents a pound. That is the provision of the bill. Now, let me read from the report of the committee, to see whether or not the committee that drafted this proposition really intends and desires to be fair with every section and every interest in the country.

I am reading from the report prepared by Mr. Young, from the Committee on Ways and Means, and submitted to the House of Representatives. He says:

The Young emergency tariff bill proposes a duty of 7 cents per pound on cotton the staple of which was  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches and longer. We are of the opinion—

Says this report—  
that the minimum length of staple on which the tariff is to be levied should be  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches.

I am reading this to the Senator from Utah. I just want to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to this matter a moment. This bill carries a tariff of 7 cents a pound on cotton the staple of which is  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches in length. Is that right?

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. The report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House says:

1. The Young emergency tariff bill proposes a duty of 7 cents per pound on cotton the staple of which was  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches and longer. We are of the opinion that the minimum length of staple on which the tariff is to be levied should be  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches, and that the duty should be increased from 7 cents to not less than 10 cents per pound.

2. Long-staple cotton is produced in the United States in certain favored areas, the most important of which are Arizona and California, in the Delta of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, in Texas and Oklahoma, in South Carolina, and to a limited extent in other cotton-producing States. The long-staple cotton produced in these areas has to compete with imported cottons, especially with those produced in Egypt and Peru.

3. Long-staple cotton is required for certain specific purposes, such as the manufacture of automobile tire fabrics, for mercerized hosiery and underwear, for sewing thread, for lawns and ladies' dress goods, and for the finer numbers of yarns. It is highly desirable to develop our production of extra staple cotton to meet the requirements of American manufacturers of such products.

4. Large areas of land in this country are available for the production of extra staple cotton, but because of the costs of reclamation, irrigation, and the higher standards of living and cost of labor, the cost of production of such cotton in the United States is high and our producers need a protective tariff to equalize the cost of production abroad with that in the United States.

5. While no official data are available, it is estimated that the cost of producing long-staple cotton in Arizona and California is 52.6 cents per pound and the cost of producing long-staple cotton in the Mississippi Delta and elsewhere in the cotton belt is about 35 cents per pound.

6. In the table following are presented quotations on the selling price of Sakellaridis Egyptian and American Egyptian cottons. It will be observed that on March 15 the price of fully good Sakellaridis was 35 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents and good fair Sakellaridis 26 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents, c. i. f., landed Boston, and that American Egyptian cotton of No. 2 grade was quoted at 26 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents and No. 3 grade at 25 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents, landed Boston. Such prices are far below the estimated cost of production of cotton in Arizona and California. It should be pointed out further from the table that the prices of good fair Sakellaridis and No. 2 Arizona Egyptian have been practically identical since November 13 last. In other words, the price of good fair Sakellaridis seems to fix the price of American Egyptian cotton. No price quotations are available for upper Egyptian cotton, but it is known to be a fact that "upper Egyptian" cottons compete directly with American cottons of staple lengths between  $1\frac{1}{2}$  and  $1\frac{3}{4}$  inches.

7. The freight rate on cotton from Alexandria, Egypt, to Boston, Mass., is 90s. per ton of 40 cubic feet, or approximately 70 cents per hundred pounds. The freight rate from California to Boston is \$1.88 per hundred pounds, and from Memphis, Tenn., to Boston is 65 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents per hundred pounds.

8. Enactment of a tariff which would give protection to cotton of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches staple and longer would serve to encourage the production of superior varieties of cotton in the United States and would tend to improve the character of the American cotton crop.

9. Producers of long-staple cotton have faced adverse market conditions in the sale of last year's crop and are said to have on hand a large part of last year's production. Accordingly it is believed that the producer would receive the benefit of whatever protection that might be conferred by the proposed tariff measure.

10. In the second table figures are presented which show the estimated production of long-staple cotton in the United States and in the world, and also the imports into the United States of Egyptian and Peruvian cotton, which constitute practically all of the imports into this country of cotton of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches or longer in staple. In passing it may be stated that small quantities of staple cotton are imported into the United States from Mexico and the West Indies, but exact statistics are not available from these countries.

The proposition that I want to ask the Senator about is this: When the report of the Ways and Means Committee, if they can justify a tariff on any length of cotton, says that it should be  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches, and the bill carries a duty on cotton with a staple of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches, why is it that they did not make it  $1\frac{1}{4}$  inches?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. The only cotton to speak of that is imported into the United States—and that is the Egyptian long-staple cotton—has a staple running from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to  $1\frac{3}{4}$  inches. The Finance Committee and also the House committee in this report decided that the only protection that was needed to cotton at all was against cotton that was imported into this country; and I will say to the Senator that  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches is rather a short staple for what is called long-staple cotton. The Egyptian cotton that is raised in Arizona has a staple running from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to  $1\frac{3}{4}$  inches. Nearly all of the Egyptian cotton that is imported into the United States has a staple of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches, and there is no necessity of applying the duty to  $1\frac{1}{2}$ . There is a little  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cotton raised in America outside of Arizona, in Alabama and certain parts of Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. As the Senator understands, I am not taking issue with the Senator on the propriety of not putting a tariff on  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -inch cotton. The Senator understands that I am against protection of every kind, but what I am asking the Senator is why in a report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House they say that the tariff should be 10 cents a pound



on cotton  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches in length, and you write a bill making it  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches?

Mr. SMOOT. Because cotton with a staple of  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches is the only cotton that is imported into this country that comes into competition at all with cotton grown in the United States.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Committee on Ways and Means says that the  $1\frac{1}{8}$ -inch cotton comes into competition.

Mr. SMOOT. The Finance Committee of the Senate did not think it did.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senator from Utah states that the facts as stated in the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House are not true so far as cotton is concerned?

Mr. SMOOT. I would not say that.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, that they are incorrect?

Mr. SMOOT. I would not say that they are not true. I think perhaps you could find a negligible quantity of cotton that comes in that is not  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length; but I want to say to the Senator that if it does come here it is because of a mistake in shipping that class of cotton, and it would be a very low-grade Egyptian cotton with a staple of  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches. There may be a few bales; I do not know; but there is no necessity of protecting it.

Mr. HARRISON. The strange thing to me is that here the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate in their report state that a tariff should be placed on cotton with a staple between  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches in length, that it competes with certain cottons from other countries, and yet the House did not place it at  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length; it put it at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches. Why did they write a report and state one thing, while in their bill they do not take care of the situation with respect to cotton with a staple less than  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether the Senator is reading from the report on the original bill or not.

Mr. HARRISON. I am reading from the Young report, that was filed with this bill recently.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the later report.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that report was made upon the basis of the report that was first made in the House. If the Senator will remember, when the bill came from the House it did carry a tariff on cotton  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length, and the report was made up on that, but it was changed in the Senate to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches.

Mr. HARRISON. No; this report says:

The Young emergency tariff bill proposes a duty of 7 cents per pound on cotton the staple of which was  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches and longer.

Then it goes on and says that the tariff ought to be on cotton  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length. Now, what I am trying to get at is this: In drafting the bill, if they say it is going to be general in character and take care of all agricultural products, and they make a statement like that, why did they not put a tariff on cotton the staple of which is  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length? All of their argument is to support the proposition that there should be a tariff on cotton the staple of which is  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length. I can not imagine any sectional feeling entered into it.

Mr. SMOOT. I think perhaps the reason why it was the same as it was in the last session is that the bill was to be reported and pass the House and pass the Senate without changing it from the rates as agreed to in conference, and the  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches was agreed to in conference.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator offer that as a justification for this action—that this was done simply because they wanted to stand by a rate carried in a previous bill?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not trying to justify it at all. The Senator asked for the reason, and that is one reason.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator think that is a pretty bad reason?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not, because I think cotton with a staple of  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches is the proper length of staple of cotton to protect. I think the Senator is wrong in the position he takes.

Mr. HARRISON. I can understand how the Senator, then, could be in favor of its being  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches; he believes that; but here is the Ways and Means Committee of the House stating that it ought to be put on  $1\frac{1}{8}$  cotton; and they put it on  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. The only thing I can say is that the Senator from Utah disagrees with the conclusions of the members of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, that is the way this bill is drafted. That is the kind of reports that are thrown in here and on which we are asked to vote.

You will see, therefore, that the new Members and all of us are asked to vote on a measure based on a report that contradicts the bill it supports.

Mr. President, I am not going to occupy much more of the time of the Senate. I want to argue one or two more propositions and then I am through.

When this bill was before the House and the Senate in December, it was offered as an emergency measure. It was said: "We want to pass it immediately, in order to take care of the present situation. There are conditions confronting this country that must be met. There are great importations of wool that are coming into the United States. There are great importations of wheat and of rice and of live stock and of all these things, and as an emergency measure we must put up a wall here quickly in order to protect the American farmer." That was the argument.

Mr. SMOOT rose.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator want to ask me something?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I was simply going to say to the Senator that that condition exists to-day, but in an exaggerated form.

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to show the Senator that it does not exist. That is just what I am going to argue.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator, no doubt, has received letters from importers of wool begging that an amendment be made to this bill, so that it will not apply to wools contracted before the 1st day of April; and yet in the last three months more than 137,000,000 pounds of wool have come into the United States, and if it goes another two months there will be enough wool in the United States to last the United States for over two years and a half. If that is not an emergency, I do not know what is.

I will not take the time of the Senator now to go into the other items mentioned.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very glad to have gotten that statement, because I expect to show just the contrary before I finish.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can not show the contrary.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, wait and you will see. That bears exactly on the point I am going to argue now. I am glad the Senator is in here. He has not been in very much. He has been busy on committee work, I know.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been here all the time, with the exception of this morning.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has been engaged on committee work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to change the figures of 137,000,000 pounds, as I have the report up to March 1, 1921—that is, January, February, and March—to 162,158,546 pounds.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in December the statement was made, and it is reiterated now, that there was an emergency existing and that they were afraid there would be such a flood of importations into this country of wool, wheat, sugar, and various other agricultural products, that they needed a tariff to protect them, so the cloture rule was attempted to be forced on us in order to pass the bill quickly. That bill was defeated purely because the President vetoed it. If that bill had been signed and had become a law the Democratic minority might have been in a very peculiar position right now in the eyes of the country.

Importations have fallen off instead of increasing, as was prophesied by the Senator from Utah and other Senators in support of this proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but not in the case of the items that this bill covers.

Mr. HARRISON. Here are the items in regard to wool imports:

In October, 1920, 1,415,000 pounds came into this country. In November, 497,000 pounds came in. In December, quite a large amount came in—3,082,000 pounds. In January, 1921, 1,140,000 pounds came in. In February, 487,000 pounds came in. In March, 369,000 pounds of wool came in. There was a falling off.

Mr. SMOOT. No; Mr. President.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, these are the figures of the Tariff Commission up here, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. If the Senator has something different, I do not know.

Mr. SMOOT. I quote figures from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. HARRISON. That is where these came from. It may be, since you have got your new crowd up there, that I can not get correct figures. I do not know about that.

Mr. SMOOT. This is for the eight months of last year, 1920. It was printed before ever the new crowd was there.

Mr. HARRISON. I know, but you have not the figures for the last few months, have you?

Mr. SMOOT. Yesterday I asked for the importations for January, February, and March of 1921.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I did yesterday.



Mr. SMOOT. And they show 162,158,546 pounds.

Mr. HARRISON. They gave me for the month of January, 1921, as I stated, 1,140,000 pounds; for February, 487,000 pounds; and for March, 369,000 pounds, showing a falling off of nearly 300 per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This reminds me of a very interesting incident occurring here in the Senate quite a number of years ago, when Senator Carter, of our State, was a Member of this body. As in this instance, upon identically the same question, essentially different figures were furnished by the two Departments of the Government, which gave rise to considerable discussion here as to which were the correct figures. Senator Carter had a reputation of being something of a compromiser, and he proposed that the two sets of figures be averaged and the result accepted by the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. The former Senator from Montana, Mr. Carter, may have accepted that during his lifetime, but the Senator from Utah does not compromise when he knows that the figures are correct, and I can tell the Senator from Montana now and the Senator from Mississippi the amount I named is correct, namely, 162,158,546 pounds. Mr. President, that is the amount of wool that came into this country in January, February, and March, 1921.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the figure given by the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. One hundred and sixty-two million one hundred and fifty-eight thousand five hundred and forty-six pounds.

Mr. HARRISON. In January, February, and March?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. That was wool?

Mr. SMOOT. That was wool.

Mr. HARRISON. According to the figures they furnished me, in January, 1921, as I stated before, there were 1,140,000 pounds, and in February a falling off down to 487,000 pounds, and in March down to 369,000 pounds imported. The Senator may have just taken them all together, or these figures may apply to only one grade of wool. Has the Senator stated them by months?

Mr. SMOOT. I have them here by classes, Mr. President, for the three months, and I got them direct from the department.

Mr. HARRISON. What I am trying to get at is this: Was there a falling off in the Senator's figures in the month of February from the month of January, and was there a falling off in March from February? The point I am pressing is constant decrease in the importations of wool.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should think there would be a falling off in February and March, because of the fact that when it was thought in the United States that there was going to be a tariff upon wool the orders ceased, and, of course, that left the months of February and March, the time when those wools would have arrived here if they had been ordered during those months, with few arrivals.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That inference might seem justifiable, but I have upon my desk this morning two letters from manufacturers of woolen goods in the State of New York.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I have copies of the letters.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Who tell that they made purchases in the month of March.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but they did not arrive here. We are talking about the wool that has arrived here.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They made purchases in the month of March of wool, not yet having arrived, so that I think it is not quite true that purchases ceased when the other bill had passed.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any doubt but what purchases ceased, Mr. President, and that began even in November. You can not buy wool from Australia and have it fly here the next day. It takes months to get it, and the purchases ceased in November and December, so the importations of wool in February and March fell off, because if the wool had been purchased in November and December it would have arrived here in February and March, and I called the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the letters to which the Senator from Montana has just referred. I suppose every Senator received them. After the President vetoed the bill they began to purchase wool again, and now they are asking that amendment be made to this bill, so that all wools purchased anywhere in the world under contract up to April 1 shall come in free.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Utah has admitted that the importations of wool into the United States in the month of February fell off from the month

of January and that the importations in March fell off from the month of February.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I admitted it, and I gave the reasons why.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's reasons, and I am going to give the reasons to the contrary. I offer these reasons merely to show that the importations of wool had been on the decline since December, and this bill was proposed in December in order to keep out the great flood of importations that they said then were coming here. The picture the Senator from Utah at that time drew was most impressive; he waxed eloquently, describing how shiploads of wools were coming in and how it would drive down the prices. Let us see what the price of wool was in the last three months. It may be that again the Senator's figures are different from mine. If I can not get correct figures at the departments since the new régime has come in, I shall be running over to the Senator's office and have him get the figures for me.

The price of fine unwashed delaine wool in December, 1920, was 47 cents. On April 30, 1921, the price was 41 cents, a falling off in price of 6 cents a pound. The general range of prices of all grades of wool in December was 48 cents, and on April 30, 1921, it was around 41 cents. If the bill had become a law in January and the importations had fallen off, as they have fallen off, then Republican Senators would have claimed much relief from the measure. The object of their bill was to increase the price of wool for the woolgrowers and to keep out importations. An examination of the facts shows that the price has not increased, although importations of that product have fallen off immeasurably. The contrary is proven from the facts of what was predicted by proponents of the legislation.

The Senator from Utah smiles. I am glad to see him smile. He is in a good humor when he smiles. The Senator evidently does not agree with me about that.

Mr. SMOOT. I really smiled at the statement the Senator made.

Mr. HARRISON. Maybe the Senator would not have made that kind of an argument, but most Republicans would. Of course, the Senator travels on a higher plane and he would not use that kind of an argument, but most Republicans would have used that kind of an argument.

You said you were going to keep out increased importations by the passage of the bill, and even though the bill failed the importations of wool have fallen off, according to the statement of the Senator himself. And when the importations fell off you predicted the price of wool would go up, and what happened was that importations fell off and the price did not increase, but went down. The results have been just the contrary of what the Senator from Utah and others predicted.

Now, I pass to wheat. We heard the Senator from North Dakota in December talking about the great importations of wheat that were threatening to come into this country. We find that in December 11,185,000 bushels came in, and in January, 1921, it had fallen down to 4,504,000 bushels, and in March down to 2,671,000 bushels. So it did not take any tariff on wheat to bring it down, but the importations decreased from December, when there were 11,000,000 bushels, down to March, when there were 2,000,000, even though the emergency bill failed. Yet if the emergency tariff bill had become a law and the importations had decreased that way, the Republicans would have claimed all the credit for the fact.

But that is not all; you contended that the price of wheat was going up when the importations fell off. Now, let us see whether or not the price did go up when the importations went off. December 15, 1920, the cash sale price of No. 1 hard winter wheat was \$1.755 per bushel. April 29, 1921, the price was \$1.46 a bushel, a falling off, in other words, of approximately 30 cents a bushel. So the very reverse results have followed; that while the importations fell off in those two months from practically 11,000,000 bushels down to 2,000,000 bushels, the price of wheat declined also.

If the bill had become law and importations ceased and the price had gone up, you would have claimed the credit; but, sirs, you can not claim it now, because the importations have fallen off and the price has decreased at the same time. If your contention had been true, that to prevent importation into this country of wheat and of wool would have increased the price of those products to the farmers of the country, then that would have been revealed when importations fell off. But the contrary is proven, because the prices of those products have decreased.

Mr. President, if you Republican Senators were so anxious to do something for the American farmer, why did you not do something in 1919 when you took control of the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. SMOOT. That is easily answered, if the Senator wants to know.



Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I would like to have the Senator answer it.

Mr. SMOOT. What would have been the use of passing legislation through this body when we knew there was a President at the other end of the Avenue who would veto it?

Mr. HARRISON. Why did you propose it in December, then, three months before the time he was going out? Was it a piece of hypocrisy you were trying to practice on the people? Were you trying to deceive them by any such thing as that?

Mr. SMOOT. No; Mr. President. If we had passed a tariff bill in 1919 it would have been a general tariff bill, and we knew that there was a large majority of Democratic Senators who were in favor of an emergency tariff bill, as demonstrated by the vote in the House and in this body.

Mr. HARRISON. Why were they not in favor of it in 1919?

Mr. SMOOT. The President of the United States in the meantime had given notice that there were certain industries here which ought to be taken care of, and we had every reason to believe he would sign the bill, and we put it up to him, and he vetoed it.

Mr. HARRISON. The argument of the Senator is this, that when the Republicans controlled the House and the Senate, in 1919, when the importations were much greater than they were in 1920, very much greater, as I shall show from the figures here, the reason why they did not pass a tariff bill was that they were afraid the President might veto it. If that was true then it was true in December last, because Wilson was President in 1919 as he was President in 1920. The Senator shakes his head. President Wilson was President in 1919, when the Republicans took charge of the House and Senate, and he was President in December, 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about that, but they were two entirely different propositions. One of them would have been a regular tariff bill. The other was an emergency tariff bill. One was right after the armistice was signed, when conditions had not changed materially from what they were during the war period. But later they had changed, and it developed that we had to have some protection for our industries through an emergency tariff bill, and that is the reason the action was taken.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, let me show some further unwarranted deductions from this bill, and the unreasonable arguments of its proponents in support of it as a revenue producer. Let us take peanuts, for instance. The rate on peanuts under the present law is three-quarters of a cent a pound. The rate under the proposed Fordney-Young bill is increased to 3 cents a pound. In the year 1920 there were imported of shelled peanuts, with a duty of three-fourths of a cent a pound, 110,000,000 pounds. But the committee's report of the last session, and used in connection with the report this session, states that under this bill, with the rate four times the present rate, there will be imported 146,847,000 pounds.

I do not understand the logic of that proposition. If 110,000,000 pounds came in in 1920, and the rate was just three-fourths of a cent a pound, how do you expect to get 146,000,000 pounds when the rate is to be 3 cents? If you expect the legislation to keep out these increased importations, why do you figure that so much greater a quantity of peanuts will come in?

Let us go down the list to something else. Take peanut oil, for instance. In 1920 the rate was 6 cents a gallon on peanut oil. There were imported into the United States 12,683,000 gallons. According to this proposition, the rate will be 26 cents a gallon, four times as high, and you say there will be imported 16,667,000 gallons. In other words, there will be 4,000,000 more gallons, with the rate four times as high, coming in under this bill as came in in 1920. If the object is to keep some of these goods from coming into this country, then by your own statement you prove it will not work that way, but we will import more into this country.

Take cottonseed oil: In 1920, with cottonseed oil on the free list, we imported practically 9,000,000 pounds. In this report, with 20 cents a gallon, or 2½ cents a pound, on cottonseed oil you estimate that there will be 96,000,000 pounds imported into this country.

Take rice: The existing rate on rice is 1 cent a pound. One hundred and eleven million six hundred and ninety-four thousand pounds came in in 1920. You raise the rate to 2 cents and you figure that 145,000,000 pounds of rice will come in under this bill. Is the object to keep some out or is it to encourage more to come in?

Take corn: In 1920 corn was on the free list, and we imported into this country 7,744,000 bushels. You estimate that under this bill, with a 15 cents a bushel tariff on it, 9,175,000 bushels will come in.

In 1920, with wool on the free list, there were imported, of washed wool, less than 8,000,000 pounds. In this report you estimate that with a 30 cents a pound tariff on it 95,000,000 pounds of wool will come in. You increase the rates, increase the protection, and it encourages a larger importation into this country, according to your estimates. I wonder what you are getting at anyhow. Some of your champions of this measure state that the rates proposed are so high importations will be prevented and practically an embargo will be erected; others contend, as shown by this report on estimated revenues, that the high rates will encourage importations and they will greatly increase. In view of these contradictions, some of us do not know what you believe and doubt that you know yourselves.

Of course, we would naturally surmise that these higher rates are intended to lessen importations. If they did not, then your whole theory fails. You have cited these estimates merely to fool some Democrats to believe that they can defend their position of espousing it as a revenue producer. You know that the rates in this bill are high and made purposely so that importations be decreased. You know, too, that not only will importations be decreased but in most instances the rates are so high that they will operate as a complete prohibition. The assertions in this report touching revenue are incorrect, misleading, and deceptive.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been out of the Chamber at lunch a few moments and I wish to inquire if the Senator from Mississippi has touched the item of cotton in the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. No; I have not discussed at length the item of cotton. I have discussed none of its specific provisions.

Mr. McKELLAR. It provides that cotton having a staple of 1½ or more inches in length shall pay 7 cents a pound. If it is the purpose to keep out Egyptian cotton that will not do it, so I am reliably informed by experts in the cotton business.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. What purpose can that possibly have unless it is to fool the unwary?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply rose to state that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHBURST] has given notice that he will discuss that question on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am told by an expert in the cotton business that a tariff on a staple of 1½ inches will not keep out Egyptian cotton at all, and that short-staple cotton does not come in, so this provision is mere surplusage in the bill if he is correct about it. It does not do any cotton farmer any good. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] shakes his head to indicate that this assertion is not correct, and I shall be very glad to have a statement from him as to what is really proposed in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I think we had better discuss it when the Senator from Arizona brings it up on Monday, although the Senator from Mississippi and I have discussed it somewhat, and I dislike to repeat that discussion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I will look in the RECORD and see what was said by the Senators on this subject while I was out of the Chamber.

While I am on my feet, if the Senator from Mississippi does not object, I should like to read just a few lines from a statement by Mr. Joseph Newburger, who is a friend of both the Senator from Mississippi and myself, and who is one of the best-posted men in the South on cotton. He says in a letter to me:

By putting a tariff on cotton with a staple of 1½ inches the Republican Party has done us no good, because this will not keep out what we are trying to keep out. If the bill would read 1½ cotton we would keep out all Egyptian cotton, as there is from 200,000 to 300,000 bales that come to this country annually, and the tariff on 1½-inch cotton would help us materially in the Delta.

He evidently knows what he is talking about. He has been in the cotton business all his life. He has raised cotton, bought cotton, and sold cotton. He is a man of fine intelligence and has studied this question thoroughly. He knows just what kind of cotton is raised in the Delta. He understands thoroughly what this provision of the bill means, and he says it will be of no value to the cotton farmer. He knows the length of all Mississippi staples, Arizona staples, Florida staples, Egyptian staples, and all other staples, and when he says this provision of the bill will not keep out Egyptian cotton we can be assured that he is correct about it.

Mr. SMOOT. He is mistaken when he says the Egyptian cotton with a staple of only 1½ inches coming in would amount to 300,000 bales. I will say to the Senator that almost the



whole of it is  $1\frac{1}{8}$  to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inch staple. Another thing, if the Senator will permit me, he should take into consideration section 17 of the bill, reading as follows:

Manufactures of which cotton of the kind provided for in paragraph 16 is the component material of chief value, 7 cents per pound, in addition to the rates of duty imposed thereon by existing law.

That would mean that there would be 7 cents a pound on about all cotton goods imported in the United States, whether it be from Egyptian cotton or not, if we should allow the staple to be reduced to  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the Senator would not say that this tax in favor of the manufacturers of cotton would help the growers of cotton. I understand the bill is intended to be in the interest of the farmers primarily, but in this instance it will not help the cotton farmers at all and will only help the manufacturers of cotton. There is a joker in these two provisions. The duty on one and three-eighths cotton will not mean anything because it will not keep Egyptian cotton out. Section 17 puts a duty of 7 cents on the manufactured cotton goods, and therefore the manufacturer of goods made out of Egyptian cotton less than one and three-eighths in staple and coming in free will be given this bounty of 7 cents a pound. This bill is certainly not framed in the interest of the cotton farmer.

Mr. SMOOT. The 7 cents a pound will apply to  $1\frac{1}{8}$ -inch cotton, and that cotton is raised in Arizona. There is a small amount raised in Alabama and some in a portion of Mississippi, but those are about the only States that raise cotton with a  $1\frac{1}{8}$ -inch staple.

Mr. HEFLIN. There is some raised in South Carolina.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a little in South Carolina, but it is so small an amount I do not know whether it is really worth mentioning.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me to reply to the Senator from Utah just a word further, if it was the purpose to help cotton generally, the one and three-eighths provision should be reduced to  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length of staple, of course, because we all know that substantially no other cotton except the Egyptian cotton comes in. Egyptian cotton is all, or substantially all, less than  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches, according to Mr. Newburger. Mr. Newburger is one of the most accomplished cotton men in this country. I will back his assertion on this subject. When he says much of Egyptian cotton is less than  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length, we can be sure he is right.

Mr. SMOOT. Less than  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. There is very little Egyptian cotton, so he says, that is more than  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length in staple. The most of it is less.

Mr. SMOOT. The gentleman is wrong if he says the great bulk of Egyptian cotton is one and one-eighth staple.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; he does not say that. He says it is less than one and three-eighths, and if that is true the bill will keep out only a very small portion of cotton, which will not affect the American long-staple cotton at all. There is a marvelous and tremendous difference between  $1\frac{1}{8}$ -inch cotton and  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -inch cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to assure the Senator that the gentleman is mistaken if he made that statement. There may be some Egyptian cotton that is a little less than  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches that is imported into this country and used in clothing in a mixture of wool in low-grade clothes, but it is so small in amount that it is practically insignificant. The Egyptian cotton is between  $1\frac{1}{8}$  and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inch staple, and I think that every man in the South who knows anything about the staple of cotton will admit that to be the fact.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me to ask the Senator from Utah another question, I think we can settle the matter. The Senator from Utah is a member of the committee. As I understand the Senator from Utah, it is the purpose to keep out the Egyptian cotton, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not the purpose to keep out Egyptian cotton. It is the purpose to protect the long-staple cotton industry in the United States. That industry has not grown to any particular extent until the last few years. That is the purpose of the provision. The  $1\frac{1}{8}$ -inch staple provision will protect our American long-staple cotton.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is the purpose to protect the long-staple cotton, why not change the provision to one and one-eighth, the provision named in the bill, so that it will protect that long-staple cotton? Of course, I differ entirely with the Senator in his views on protection. I do not believe in the protective theory, but if he is so desirous to do the long-staple cotton grower some good, why does he not arrange that provision of the bill so it will protect him? Why put it in the bill when it will protect him in practically no degree at all? The

cotton men down South probably know more about this subject than the Senator from Utah, though my good friend is an expert on most subjects. The fact is there is an immense amount of long staple cotton grown along the Mississippi River in what is known as the Delta; a very great deal of it is grown there, and under the provisions of the bill that cotton grown in the Mississippi Valley and practically no other American cotton is protected at all. The provision is merely a matter of surplusage in the bill. It may catch some staples, but I do not see how it is possible under the information furnished by Mr. Newburger.

Mr. SMOOT. It will protect the long-staple cotton of Mississippi. It will protect the long-staple cotton of Arizona. It will protect the long-staple cotton of Alabama. It is not proposed to protect the short-staple cotton.

Mr. McKELLAR. It could not catch any other kind of staple, because no other kind of staple comes into this country. If you made the provision 1 inch in length or three-quarters of an inch in length, you would not keep any cotton out except the long-staple Egyptian cotton, because that is the only cotton which comes in. No short-staple cotton comes into this country, or substantially none.

Mr. HARRISON. Before the Senator from Tennessee came into the Chamber I had discussed the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on this proposition, and in their report, if the Senator will read it, he will find that the committee said there should be protection on cotton  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length and up, but as it has been brought into the Senate the bill provides  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches. They stated in the report what the Senator from Tennessee now states, but the Senator from Utah takes issue on that proposition. Of course, the bill carrying a duty on cotton of  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length gives a complete answer to the insincerity of the proponents of this legislation as expressed in their report that they desired to deal fairly with the agricultural interests of every section and that cotton of  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length needed protection. This is in keeping with the record of Republican leadership.

Mr. SMOOT. There is another thing I wish to say to the Senators that the House Members I think did not take into consideration when first establishing the  $1\frac{1}{8}$ -inch staple. The administration of imposing a tax on cotton goods imported into this country under section 17, if the staple was  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches, would be impossible. No one could tell in 90 per cent of the goods that would be shipped into this country whether the staple was  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches or 1 inch, but where the long-staple cotton of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches and above is used anyone familiar with the manufacture of goods made from Egyptian cotton can tell it at once. When you get down to a staple of  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches there would not be a yard of cotton goods imported into the country but what would have to be examined to decide whether it contained  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches, as provided in section 17 of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. What the bill does under sections 16 and 17 is this: It does not protect long-staple cotton at all, or practically not at all. I doubt if it will keep out 10,000 bales of Egyptian cotton. Under section 17 it would protect all the manufacturers who make Egyptian cotton or American cotton into cloth. It is very cunningly devised, so that the farmer raising long-staple cotton, whether he lives in the Imperial Valley or anywhere else, is not protected at all, or practically not at all, but the manufacturer who puts the long-staple American cotton into the cloth or the manufacturer who puts Egyptian cotton into the cloth will receive the benefit, because section 17 provides that—

Manufactures of which cotton of the kind provided for in paragraph 16.

And that means Egyptian cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. If it is not of that kind, they do not get any protection. I am quite sure the Senator has not given thought to the question or he would not have uttered that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have given thought to it, and that is why I make the statement. Section 16 is the joke and section 17 is the joker in this bill. It is only one of many.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course,  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length could not apply to some of the cotton raised in Arizona. It will not apply to any cotton raised in the Delta of the Mississippi, because that cotton is around  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches in length, and the facts show that 48 per cent of the cotton of that length that is raised in the United States is raised in the Delta of the Mississippi. For my part I am in favor of no protection of any kind, and I wish the Senate to understand that. I have so voted, and would so vote again.

However, the curious thing to me is that if the purpose of those who drafted the legislation is to apply its provisions generally to the agricultural interests of the country on the principle of protection, when their report says cotton  $1\frac{1}{8}$  inches



should be protected the same as 1½ inches, why it is that they write into the bill 1½ inches in length? Of course, I have understood the Senator's explanation of it. It is different from the explanation of the House Ways and Means Committee on that proposition.

I stated before I was interrupted that in 1919 there was more reason, if there ever could be any reason, for asking the Congress to pass emergency legislation, but certainly no reason now exists because the importation of practically every article and of every product that is carried in the emergency tariff bill of 1920 has fallen off since that time. The facts as stated by the Senator from Utah touching wool show the importations of that item have fallen off; wheat has fallen off; rice has fallen off; live stock has fallen off. Article by article the importations into this country since December last, when they said the emergency existed, have fallen off so that the emergency does not exist to-day, and there is no flood of those products threatening to come into the United States at this time. It was a bugaboo that was held up to the Senate and to the House that those great importations were coming. The facts now show that they did not come. On the contrary, month by month and day by day those importations have fallen off.

In 1919 the importations of wool into this country amounted to 440,290,279 pounds, while in 1920 the importations of wool amounted to 259,617,000 pounds; in other words, there was a falling off in the year 1920 in the importations of wool of 180,000,000 pounds; yet, during the time that this great flood of importation of wool to the amount of 440,000,000 pounds was coming into this country, the Senators from wool-growing States who are now pleading for this emergency legislation sat quietly by, did not raise their voices, did not appeal for legislation to stop its importation into this country. At that time the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and other Senators, perhaps, could have rendered some real service to the wool growers of the country; and I suspect they will have much difficulty in explaining to the wool farmers of Utah and other wool-growing States why, when the great importations of wool were coming, they sat serenely by and did not murmur, but now without the slightest cloud of threatened danger upon the horizon they cry loud and constant.

That condition did not apply only to wool, but it applied to some other products. Let us take cattle, for instance. In 1919 the importation of cattle amounted to 263,000 head more than in 1920; that is, we imported 70 per cent more in 1919 than we imported in the year 1920. For the months of September, October, and November, in 1919, we imported 128,000 head more than during the same months in 1920. Why did not some one interested in live stock who thought that a tariff bill offered a panacea, in order to help the producers of stock, try to do something at that time to stop the tide of importations into this country?

Let us take sheep. In 1919, 224,000 head of sheep were imported into this country, while in 1920 only 172,000 head came in, so that 52,000 head of sheep less were imported in 1920 than were imported in 1919; yet, while Senators on the other side of the aisle controlled the Senate, and the Republicans were in control of the House in 1919, they did not attempt to draft any measure in order to try to stop the importation of sheep into this country at that time. So it was down the line. I will not proceed to read the entire list, but Senators may take every article and they will find that 1919 was the time when the great influx of importations was coming, and that there has been a falling off constantly ever since.

Mr. President, when this legislation was first conceived and brought out of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House it was not nearly so bad as it was when it came to the Senate and was referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate. It was not so bad when it was referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate as it was when it passed the Senate. It was not so bad when the President vetoed the measure last Congress as it now is. Every day of its progress it has had a tendency either to increase the rates or include other propositions.

When the bill was first reported out of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives it did not carry any protection to the great Sugar Trust.

That tax on sugar means \$125,000,000 additional burden of taxation on the consumers of the country. It is proposed to give that much to the great Sugar Trust of the land and increase to that extent the price of sugar.

When the bill first came out of the Ways and Means Committee of the House there was no provision in it for a tariff or a tax on frozen meat, but it got over here in the Senate—that was shortly after the packer legislation had been considered—and some one who was interested in that legislation wanted to

give the packers more protection because they controlled the frozen-meat situation in this country; so they said, "Let us protect them in order that the frozen meats from South America may not come in here and compete with the frozen meats of the five big packers." When that was done, a tariff burden was put upon the consumers of the country, who need meat in order to live, of practically \$500,000,000 annually. So going down the line to hides and the Woolen Trust, they are the ones who get the benefit out of this legislation.

Every line in the bill is a challenge to the welfare of the consumers of the country and an imposition on the farmers of a greater burden. Within its folds it invites retaliatory measures from every country to which we sell our goods. Instead of helping it is going to hurt, because what the farmers of this country need, what they want, is a market throughout the world in which to sell their surplus products. That applies to wheat; it applies to cotton; it applies to practically everything except sugar and wool and rice. So what the farmers need is a market for their surplus cotton, their surplus wheat, and their other surplus agricultural products. When some understanding among the nations of the world is brought about and when the wisdom of this administration shall extend some credit to those countries which have always opened up their markets to us, then they will buy of us and the farmers will get better prices for their products.

If you have a real desire to help the farmers, then you should pass some legislation that will take care of additional loans on farm lands. You should pass some legislation touching the railroads, so that the present high and unreasonable freight rates may be reduced. God knows that the farmer now can hardly ship anything, so high are the transportation rates. I received a letter only the other day from the little town in Mississippi in which I was raised, which is located in a great agricultural section and which ordinarily ships more vegetables than does any other center in the whole United States, and from that letter it appears that on many of the products which they are raising the farmer in all probability will lose money because of the high transportation rates. If you really want to relieve the economic situation in this country and to remove the disadvantages under which the people are now laboring, then change the railroad law; reduce freight rates; and go about it in some other way than to pass a piece of legislation such as that embodied in the pending bill. This legislation is a species of deception, fraud, and hypocrisy; it is a betrayal of promises that will rise to plague the Republican Party; it is a repudiation of every pledge made by you in the late campaign; and it will mark the beginning of your end.

#### EXCESSIVE FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, there is a very general demand throughout the West for the passage of the emergency tariff bill. It is a measure which should have been passed long ago, and I hope that it will be speedily enacted into law.

There is another phase of the agricultural situation which I desire to discuss briefly at this time. Mr. President, I rise to present appeals from a large number of Middle West States for relief from the intolerable railway rates that have brought on business stagnation throughout the country. These appeals come from governors, mayors, State railway commissions, agricultural and live-stock associations, and, in addition, I have several hundred communications from merchants, bankers, farmers, stockmen, and representatives of all lines of industry and trade. All these petitioners for relief warn us that we shall soon have a nation-wide paralysis of business if help does not come quickly. I have never known a more alarming situation, so far as the business of the West is concerned, and that is why I wish to lay stress on the urgency of quick action. High railway rates are not entirely responsible, but they have had a great deal to do with it.

The State board of agriculture of Kansas has asked me to present this appeal to the President and Congress:

Present freight rates are in many instances confiscatory and in practically all cases work a severe hardship on agricultural and live-stock producers and shippers, as well as the consuming public.

Producers of grain and live stock are threatened with ruin if present conditions should continue longer. We believe the present deplorable condition of agriculture is due to discrimination against this basic industry in the matter of transportation, credit, tariff, and marketing. Notwithstanding the low price for food products received by the producers of the country, the consumer is forced to pay an increase of several hundred per cent over such prices.

We strongly urge readjustment of railroad rates on a lower basis at the earliest possible moment.

I have been asked to lay before the Senate the following resolutions adopted at a conference of 500 shippers, held recently in Chicago, which included over 500 representatives of the leading agricultural, live-stock, and commercial organizations of the entire country:



Whereas the increased rates of freight are in many instances prohibitory, and in other instances restricted, and in all cases burdensome upon the commerce of the country, thereby preventing, curtailing, and limiting production, and depriving farmers, stock raisers, producers, and manufacturers generally of an opportunity to do business, destroying their profits and paralyzing the industries of the country because the traffic can not fully move; and

Whereas there can be no revival of business, so that production, trade, and commerce can be restored to a normal condition and a return of prosperity brought about without a material reduction in these rates; and

Whereas the operating expenses of the railroads are enormously increased by the wages, the working conditions, and rules under which they are operating, reflecting a direct burden upon the industries of the country and creating a paralysis of its business in every direction; and

Whereas we believe that it is imperative that the Government exercise its reasonable constituting powers, to the end of so changing these conditions that the railroad companies shall exercise their right as owners of the property to pay such wages as are just and reasonable, and that will permit them to transport the commerce of the country upon rates which will freely move traffic and yet pay a reasonable wage according to the conditions: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the transportation act establishing the Labor Board be so amended that the power of the Government may be administered by that tribunal that the wages shall be just and reasonable according to the circumstances and the railroads not compelled to pay more than will permit them under economical management to move the traffic of the country under rates which are just and reasonable, and which will permit farmers, stockholders, and producers from the soil, the sources of primary wealth, to make a competency and earn a living and continue production to supply the vital needs of the people.

That we favor the repeal of section 15a of the act to regulate commerce, known as the rate-making rule, as added in the transportation act of 1920.

That we favor such amendment to the act to regulate commerce as shall specifically define the right, power, and jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to the making and rendering of any decision or prescribing any rate which shall have the effect of destroying the right, power, or jurisdiction of a State with respect to intrastate rates and transportation. And that where the Interstate Commerce Commission, by reason of the fact that a rate of any State on intrastate traffic constitutes a discrimination or preference as against interstate rates or commerce, that it is the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an order against any carrier to cease or desist from collecting such intrastate rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission must, as a condition precedent to such order, specifically define such rate and make a finding of facts with respect thereto, and that no such order shall be made except as to correct an actual, material, and plain discrimination or preference, and further that such State rate is unjust and unreasonable for the service performed. Which decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be subject to be set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the State when such decision is beyond its power or contrary to law and during the pendency of which such court may suspend such order.

I also desire to call attention to a resolution adopted recently by the executive committee of the American National Live Stock Association, urging the repeal of the guaranty provision of the transportation act, and also asking that the powers of the States be unaffected by the arbitrary rule established by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the prevailing transportation charges on live stock are unjust, unreasonable, exorbitant, and even prohibitory;

Whereas under the transportation act surrendering the railroads under Federal control, as the Interstate Commerce Commission construes the act, the provision thereof contained in section 15a, as part of the act to regulate commerce, establishing a rule on which to base rates, on the theory of producing a 6 per cent return on the aggregate value of railroad property, in rate-making groups, fixes a standard arbitrarily requiring that States conform their rates thereto, and binds the Interstate Commerce Commission so to adjust the rates as to produce that return for two years; and

Whereas this destroys all the rights and remedies to secure reasonable rates, and the rights of States to make intrastate rates, by subjecting the rate-making power to the limitations of this arbitrary rule: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the repeal of said section of the act, so as to leave the powers of the States unaffected by such arbitrary rule, as well as all the rights and remedies to secure just and reasonable rates to the shippers on the railroads which they use, under the other provisions of the act to regulate commerce, and the powers of the commission to make reasonable rates.

Then I have telegrams from the governors of several Western States. For instance, Gov. Shoup, of Colorado, says:

DENVER, COLO., May 4, 1921.

ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Existing freight rates in many instances render it impossible for business to continue at a profit and also prevent development. Immediate and substantial reduction of rates of farm and orchard products, live stock, and building material is a vital necessity to this State. Prewar basis of rates to, from, and between Colorado points were excessive and discriminatory. Continued increases have proportionately increased such burdens to where the sacred right of our industries to protection against exaction of actual prohibited rates is involved. The last general assembly authorized me to appoint a transportation committee, which has been appointed and is beginning a survey of entire situation. Their first petition, covering most vital needs, will be hurried to Interstate Commerce Commission as soon as compiled, as we must have immediate relief for movement of this season's crop. General reduction of class and commodity rates, both intrastate and interstate, will also be asked for. I trust the petitions of this committee will receive prompt consideration and action.

O. H. SHOUP, Governor.

I have similar telegrams from Gov. Hyde, of Missouri; from Gov. Allen, of Kansas; from Gov. McKelvie, of Nebraska; from

Gov. Mecham, of New Mexico; and from Gov. Frazier, of North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegrams printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., May 5, 1921.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Present freight rates are restricting movement of farm products in this State, particularly so in the matter of corn, oats, and hay, these being per unit the lower-priced products. The freight rates on live stock do not seem to have materially affected the sale thereof. A decrease in commodity freight rates on low-grade, heavy-weight articles, such as coal, lumber, brick, etc., and upon farm products would materially stimulate railroad traffic on these products and aid these industries and the farmer. It would also have the psychological effect of encouraging the farmer.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Governor.

TOPEKA, KANS., May 4, 1921.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Beyond all question present level of transportation rates are so high as to seriously embarrass movement of heavy commodities, including grain and live stock. In the general economic structure producing, selling, and transportation costs must have their proper relation. Through this period these costs are seeking some normal relation. Prices of live stock and agricultural products have returned to practically prewar prices, while transportation charges are from 60 to 100 per cent of that basis. I regard it as highly essential that present heavy burden of transportation charges shall be lessened at the earliest possible time.

HENRY J. ALLEN, Governor.

LINCOLN, NEBR., April 30.

There can be no doubt that the existing schedule of freight rates is having a very unfavorable influence upon business generally in this State and particularly upon agriculture. I think this fact will be admitted by the railroads themselves, and I believe it is quite a general impression that there must be some readjustment of railroad rates before there can be a very rapid return to normal conditions in business.

S. R. MCKELVIE, Governor.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., May 4.

Existing freight rates interfering seriously with business generally in New Mexico, principally affecting agriculture, live stock, and mining industries.

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,  
For Gov. MECHAM.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., April 29, 1921.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Present schedule of freight rates decidedly detrimental to business, including agriculture and live-stock industries. Intrastate rates have not been raised on account of action brought by State, which is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. North Dakota freight rates have always been discriminatory, favoring the Twin Cities. Bulk of our product is shipped out of State, and mile-ton rates on our lignite coal and other products of neighboring States should not be more than rate on similar products in other States.

LYNN J. FRAZIER, Governor.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the most pressing question in the United States at this moment, and the greatest obstacle in the way of a return to normal conditions and the restoration of business, is the high cost of transportation.

The semimystery of the recent arrival at our seaports of shiploads of foreign products, products of which this country has an exportable surplus of its own, becomes clearer when we learn that a bushel of grain can be shipped to New York from South America for 12 cents, but that it costs 38 cents to ship a bushel of wheat to that city from Minneapolis by rail.

When cottonseed cake, used in feeding cattle, can be shipped cheaper from Texas to Holland than from Texas to Kansas, something is wrong with the transportation charges.

A farmer in one of the great hay-producing regions of Kansas writes me:

We have hundreds and hundreds of tons of hay here ready to ship, but because of the low price and high freight rates we can not get expenses out of it and are compelled to let it rot on the ground.

A car of grain shipped from Texas Panhandle to market at an expense of \$525 brought the producer \$475. Out of that he had to pay more than \$100 for thrashing the grain and, of course, sold his produce at a loss.

Texas and Florida truck farmers have shipped produce to the New York market and received nothing in return but a bill for the balance due on freight and commission charges, so reports the New York market commissioner.

The freight and commission charges on a car of lettuce for which a truck farmer received \$939 cost him \$491.

It costs as much to ship California oranges as it does to grow them.



Western live-stock men tell the Interstate Commerce Commission the existing rates will ruin them if continued. Cattle freights from Des Moines to Chicago have increased from 22 cents a hundred in 1914 to 37 cents in 1921. Of this increase of 15 cents, labor has secured approximately 11 cents.

The rate on wheat from Chicago to New York was 7.80 cents in 1918; to-day it is 19.8 cents. The rate on corn from Kansas City to Chicago has doubled in the last four years. Similar increases are found all over the country.

Michigan's iron mines report to the commission that they can no longer afford to pay the new rates on ore, and must close the mines if they do not get relief.

Mr. President, the Interstate Commerce Commission is buried under petitions for lower freight rates from big business concerns. But the man who is hit harder than anybody is the farmer. He is the Nation's greatest freight payer. He pays freight both ways. He gets it coming and going. There is altogether too big a gap between what the farmer gets for his crops and what he has to pay for them.

With corn selling around 25 to 30 cents a bushel in farm communities, farmers are obliged to pay from 5 to 10 cents a bushel for shucking, 5 cents for shelling, and the increased freight rates to market. What they have left will not buy a sack of table salt.

A Nimrod, Minn., potato raiser writes me that to ship 100 pounds of potatoes to Chicago costs him 60 cents. What he has over to pay for his labor and investment in raising and digging and hauling 100 pounds of potatoes is just 35 cents.

Texas rice growers can ship rice across the ocean to Liverpool and from Liverpool back to New York cheaper than they can ship it by rail direct from Beaumont, Tex., to New York.

Cotton can be shipped from Galveston to Bremen, a distance of 3,000 miles, for 35 cents a hundred pounds. But to ship by rail a bale of cotton from the interior of Texas a distance of 300 miles cost 95 cents a hundred—about three times as much.

Spinach, cabbage, and onions rot in the fields of Texas; hay and corn are wasting in Kansas; fruits are stacked in California; and hides are going to waste in all parts of the country because these products can not be shipped over American railroads at profit.

Freight rates are blamed by both producer and consumer. But in most cases there is also a toll taker somewhere along the line who is not getting the blame that is coming to him, although taking more than his share of the benefits.

E. W. Cole, Texas director of markets, writes me that 3,000 cars of early vegetables have been lost up to this time because it did not pay to ship them.

To ship shelled corn from Hydro, Okla., to Wichita Falls, Tex., about 125 miles, costs 27 cents a bushel, or almost as much as the corn will bring at destination.

Raisers of oats in Kansas, Colorado, and New Mexico can not get enough money by shipping the crop to cover the cost of handling from farm to railway station.

"Virtually all our perishable products will rot in the fields," writes J. A. Whitehursts, president of the Oklahoma State Board of Agriculture.

Because of extortionate freight charges the stock-raising industry in North Dakota is slowly being choked to death, reports V. E. Smart, traffic expert of North Dakota's board of railroad commissioners.

T. W. Tomlinson, secretary of the American National Live Stock Association, writes:

Idaho, which ordinarily ships thousands of cars, has scarcely been able to ship a car of alfalfa this season.

Cattlemen of New Mexico and Texas, accustomed at this time of year to ship their herds to Kansas to fatten on grass, this year have no money to pay the freight bill and can not borrow it from their banks.

Live-stock men east of the Missouri River usually buy much alfalfa hay in Colorado and Kansas to feed their stock. This year there was no such market. Good alfalfa hay at \$6 to \$8 a ton on board cars in Colorado costs from \$15 to \$18 a ton to ship to Illinois, making the hay cost delivered \$21 to \$26 a ton. For similar reasons all alfalfa-meal mills in the West have closed down.

Illinois farmers who used more than 40,000 tons of raw rock phosphate last year for fertilizer this year virtually are doing without because of prohibitive freight charges. The same situation exists in Ohio where ground limestone is used for fertilizer.

Mr. President, when the present rail rates were adopted our farmers were receiving \$2 a bushel or better for wheat and \$1.60 a bushel for corn. With corn now selling at country shipping stations at 30 cents, the 25-cent shipping rate to the

central market takes more than half of the corn crop's below-cost value.

It costs more to ship fruit from the Pacific coast to the Middle West, or produce from the Middle West to the East, than it does to bring these products here from foreign countries, and the high value of the American dollar and the excessive exchange rate do the rest.

While Italy sells her lemon crop here, our lemons rot because they do not bring enough to pay freight rates. We are getting wheat from Canada and Argentina, butter from Denmark, eggs and poultry from starving China, potatoes from Norway, mutton from New Zealand, corn and beef from South America, and wool from everywhere.

At the same time sheep from our ranges, fruit from Florida and California, vegetables from Texas and the South, hay and oats and other products from the West, have been sold in the big market for less than enough to pay the freight, consequently enormous quantities of these home-grown products are now being allowed to rot because it does not pay to ship them. Barely 25 per cent of the Texas cabbage crop will be marketed. Freight charges on a car of cabbage from Harlingen, Tex., to a commission merchant at Hastings, Nebr., were \$425. The growers received less than \$75 for their labor.

Mr. President, not only do we have this situation in regard to agriculture, we have a Nation-wide stagnation of general business, for commerce between the States is hit almost as hard by high rates of transit as is agriculture. We have, in fact, an embargo on ourselves and must find a speedy means of removing it if we are going to get business off its dead center and save the railroads from receiverships and bankruptcy.

When railroads get more for hauling farm products than the producers are paid for producing them it is evident that freight rates are relatively too high. And that is chiefly what is the matter with the railway situation at the present time.

Rates higher than the traffic will bear have made a difference of a million freight cars in the amount of shipping this country is doing. Six months ago there was a deficiency of half a million freight cars. At the close of April this year there was a half million surplus of cars. This means that a half million freight cars now stand idle on the sidetracks of American railroads. Need there be a more convincing argument that lower rates must precede a business recovery?

Mr. President, it is true of the railroad business, as it is of any other business, that it is entitled to a fair return. The roads can not be expected to give good service and maintain equipment unless they can earn a fair return. No business can be operated successfully or efficiently without such a return.

I favored returning the railroads to private management and competition, because under Government operation the roads were milking the Treasury of millions of dollars to pay dividends, under an agreement which put no premium on efficiency and service and no penalty on waste and extravagance.

We all know the result.

The roads now have their fate in their own hands. Unless they can put traffic charges on a live-and-let-live basis, and that very soon, a return to Government operation or ownership will be inevitable. And neither the people nor the shippers wish this to happen any more than do the railroad managers. Certainly neither the country nor the Government should take up any new burdens at this time, nor embark on any epochal experiments, except under compulsion.

The people have paid the railroads nearly \$1,000,000,000 within the last few years by way of a Government guaranty. On top of that they have paid higher rail rates, amounting to from 50 to 83 per cent. These rates almost absorb the farmers' grain, also a large percentage of his live stock; they have absorbed the decrease in the price of lumber; they have helped in many ways to demoralize the business of the country and to prevent its recuperation. And with all this the roads now are stalled on the upgrade; they are not making expenses, not getting any new business.

The chief reason is that, with other values coming down and with farm prices at bedrock, the roads are charging more than the traffic will bear. This means that as long as present rates are maintained the roads will not be able to do enough business to maintain themselves.

How is this policy going to get them or anybody else anywhere?

A few weeks ago the greatest railroad system in the United States, the Pennsylvania, was losing one-fourth million dollars a day in reduced traffic. This is the kind of business that high rail rates are creating for the railroads. It is expensive business for everybody.



Mr. President, nothing is going to be gained by maintaining rail rates at a point which makes the railways too expensive for the people to use.

The country now is suffering from what is merely another form of car shortage, for although the roads still are inadequately supplied with rolling stock for normal times, rates are so prohibitive that we can not use the cars we have. Therefore while railroads and the people suffer, commerce and business stagnate and the roads face bankruptcy, all because of this crushing embargo placed on the Nation by its transporting system.

The way out is to encourage the people to use the railroads by making it possible for them to ship goods and travel; to give business a chance to create more business. There is no profit in rusting rails for anybody.

Meanwhile the situation appears to be growing worse instead of better, as might be expected when rates are in many cases so high as to be prohibitive. The big slump is due in part no doubt to the general and inevitable afterwar depression. But a time when business men find high freight rates barring the way to a return of normal conditions is no time for the roads to insist on prohibitive rates.

Our attitude toward the railroads should probably be more sympathetic than condemnatory. Most of those misguided men who in the past exploited the railroads and used them to exploit the people have gone to their final reckoning. The present situation demands helpful teamwork. The roads are too much a vital part of our daily life to make it pay to belabor, injure, or cripple them in any way. Nor can the present rates be defended or be allowed to stand. They are suicidal, as injurious to the roads as to the people.

The railroads will find it profitable to do their share to help bring about a revival of business instead of being the greatest obstacle in the way of such a revival. They may for a time have to take losses, along with farmers, other industries, and business interests, but I am confident it will be nothing like what is certainly ahead of them if the better policy of lower rates is not soon adopted. There can be no defense for the highest rail rates in history at a time when every rail-carried commodity is seeking the prewar price level. Freight charges which exceed the value of the product carried can not be defended nor endured.

This being the most vital and pressing of the questions before the country, it must have the best and first thought of Congress and the administration. If Congress finds the country's transporting system is not being handled on an efficient basis, as is charged, and that certain economies or methods are necessary, the Interstate Commerce Commission must be directed to put such a policy into operation. In the meantime I believe the Interstate Commerce Commission should immediately use its powers to initiate and modify rates and make such readjustments as will restore the movement of traffic.

Mr. President, I have introduced a bill calling for the repeal of the section of the transportation act directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make rates which will assure a return of 6 per cent to the carriers. I have also included in this bill a provision setting aside the authority of the commission to regulate intrastate rates. I am undertaking to repeal the guarantee clause because the commission bases its claim of power to increase State rates largely upon the command which is contained in this section that it so adjust rates as to yield the percentage specified, and it is upon this section that the decision of the lower Federal courts sustaining the orders of the commission appear to be principally based. This bill has the hearty support of the State railway commission of every State that has come to my attention, and 12 legislatures have appealed to Congress for this legislation.

Mr. President, I repeat that the railroad situation is so acute that immediate action is imperative to restore normal conditions to agriculture.

We are now under compulsion to go to the bottom of the railroad problem. We must get the facts, work out a constructive program at once that will restore the country and the roads to their normal relationship and put an end to the recurrence of the railroad problem. There is no other way.

#### MOTHERS' DAY.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in the spring of 1914, while a Member of the House, I introduced a joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mothers' Day. The House passed that resolution, and I requested my good friend the able and distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD] to take charge of the measure in the Senate. He did so, and the Senate passed it. President Wilson issued a proclamation, under

the authority given by the resolution, requesting all the officials of the Government to display the flag on all public buildings on the second Sunday in May. He sent a message to our foreign possessions to have the flag displayed there in honor of the mothers of America.

The first Mothers' Day officially observed I stood in front of the White House at the noon hour. The fountain in front, in perpetual play, looked like a sunburst of diamonds. Back of it, in solemn grandeur, stood the White House. Above it, in all the pride of civic glory, waved the flag of the Republic. I said, "That dear old flag has been unfurled many a time above the brave armies of America, but never have its sacred folds floated above a braver army than that of the heroic mothers of America."

The poet spoke truly when he said:

The greatest battle that ever was fought—  
Shall I tell you where and when?  
On the map of the world you will find it not;  
It was fought by the mothers of men.

On this day President Harding has issued a proclamation for the observance of Mothers' Day, which is to-morrow. He will call upon Government officials and men and women everywhere to display the flag in honor of the mothers of America.

In honoring the mothers of America we honor ourselves. We honor our Government.

Man inherits the nobler, gentler qualities of being from his mother. They come from the treasure house of feminine charm and sweetness. They are filtered through the finer sensibilities of the female soul. The hearthstone, as Henry Grady said, is the true altar of liberty, and the strength of the Republic is lodged in the homes of the people. Mr. President, another poet beautifully describes the feeling of us all, when he said:

The world at times has beat me back  
In battles I have fought;  
Not always has the god Success  
Touched tasks in which I wrought;  
Full oft has fortune dealt a blow  
Instead of bent to bless,  
And heartache followed close upon  
The heels of happiness;  
And often when a solemn wee  
Of grief my heart intoned,  
And often when my spirit writhed  
And all my nature groaned,  
There stole refrain that softened pain,  
Not phrased by mortal tongue,  
But born of memories old and sweet—  
The songs my mother sung  
When she took me in her arms  
And gently stroked my hair,  
And bore me with her down to sleep  
In that old bye-bye chair.

One of the most fascinating scenes in all the world is a mother in the home circle with a baby in her arms. Mr. President, the most beautiful thing this side of Heaven is the mother's love for her child. It is the only love amongst mortals which will suffer all things and endure all things. Through poverty and good fortune, through sickness and health, through life to death, it is the same beautiful, unselfish, unchangeable mother love; and—

He who harking back to youth  
Goes forth and nobly dies  
To color life to match the light  
That shines from mother's eyes.  
He will not pride his faltering feet  
Upon the race they've made,  
But will search his heart, and bless the part  
That mother love has played.  
He'll walk down the ways of life,  
And in his daily prayer  
Thank God that all his best was born  
In that old bye-bye chair.

All honor to the mothers of America. On to-morrow let those of us whose mothers have preceded us to the better land wear the white flower, and let those whose mothers still linger to bless with their benedictions and love the households of America wear the red flower, and let the flag of our country fly from every Government building and rooftop in the country in honor of the mothers of America.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to inquire if any other Senator wishes to speak this afternoon? [After a pause.] As no one desires to take the floor, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 9, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.



## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 7, 1921.*

## ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Francis M. Goodwin.

## DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

William M. Steuart.

## REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

John Kelsey Jones, at Harrison, Ark.

## RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Willis W. Moore, at Harrison, Ark.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

## GENERAL OFFICERS.

*To be major generals.*

William Gray Price, jr.

Avery Delano Andrews.

*To be brigadier generals.*

William Ruthven Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.

Dwight Edward Aultman, Field Artillery.

Johnson Hagood, Coast Artillery Corps.

Dennis Edward Nolan, Infantry.

William Durward Connor, Corps of Engineers.

Fox Conner, Field Artillery.

Preston Brown, Infantry.

Malin Craig, Cavalry.

Henry Davis Todd, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

Albert Jesse Bowley, Field Artillery.

William Hartshorne Johnston, Infantry.

Robert Alexander, Infantry.

## MEDICAL CORPS.

*To be captains.*

Charles Fremont Snell.

Jaime Julian Figueras.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

*To be first lieutenant.*

John Lawrence Hanley.

## QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

*To be captain.*

George Anthony Horkan.

*To be first lieutenant.*

Everett Roscoe Stevens.

## ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

*To be captain.*

Edward Elliott MacMorland.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

## MARINE CORPS.

*To be captain.*

Arthur H. Turner.

*To be first lieutenants.*

Thomas E. Kendrick.

Kenneth O. Cuttle.

*To be second lieutenants.*

Karl F. Umlor.

Thomas McK. Schuler.

Marvin V. Yandle.

Warren Sessions.

Leo Healey.

## POSTMASTERS.

## DELAWARE.

Richard F. McClure, Claymont.

## MAINE.

Pearl Danforth, Castine.

Joseph C. A. Daigenault, Jackman Station.

George M. Jackson, Millbridge.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

William J. Williams, Great Barrington.

Charles A. Kimball, Littleton.

Harry T. Johnson, Medway.

Edgar A. Craig, North Easton.

## NEBRASKA.

Henry Eichelberger, Crete.

Lewis A. Meinzer, Falls City.

Ernest W. Clift, Humboldt.

Edward B. Jameson, Lakeside.

Luther J. Saylor, Rising City.

Isaac L. Pindell, Sidney.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, May 9, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the sunlight of the morning. Grant that our hearts may be filled with light and life and joy, and enter upon the duties awaiting us with the consciousness of Thy smile upon us, and that we want to walk along the pathway of duty with Thy direction and under Thy guidance. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY, a Senator from the State of Michigan, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NEW. I desire to present and have printed in the RECORD a copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Indiana Legislature, on behalf of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, in approval of a plan to make the St. Lawrence River navigable for ocean-going vessels.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

A concurrent resolution approving the action of the governor in advancing the undertaking for a deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean.

Whereas it is proposed to make such improvements in the St. Lawrence River as to make the Great Lakes accessible to ocean-going commerce, and as this improvement will in effect bring the State of Indiana hundreds of miles nearer the world's markets, and as there are within the State great resources that lie wholly undeveloped while the production of all things is diminished or retarded by distance from markets, and because our producers and the consuming public have alike suffered enormous losses in the last three years by transportation shortage and failure; and because by reason of these conditions the transportation situation constitutes an emergency need, and as a number of States have joined in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, having as its object the early undertaking and completion of this improvement: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the State of Indiana is properly associated in the above-named organization with its neighboring Commonwealths in pressing to advance this undertaking, and that the action of the governor in so declaring is hereby approved and confirmed by the participation of this State, by the governor and those who represent him in the council of these States, is approved.*

SEC. 2. That the representatives of this State in Congress of the United States be requested to facilitate and expedite in every way possible the prosecution of this undertaking for the economic freedom of a land-locked continent.

NOTE.—The above resolution was passed in Indiana Senate and House March 1, 1921.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association desire it entered on the Senate's record in Washington.

Yours, truly,

C. H. COMSTOCK, Secretary.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., May 5, 1921.

Mr. COLT presented a memorandum from Rev. M. Zalitch, sundry citizens, and sundry organizations of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, in relation to the case of East Galicia, requesting that the Government of the United States recognize East Galicia, along with northern Bukovina, as an independent state, the west Ukrainian republic; that the Government of the United States recognize the lawful government of the west Ukrainian republic, namely, the government established by the Ukrainian national assembly under the leadership of Dr. Eugene Petrushevich; and that the Government of the United States, as one of the temporary sovereigns of East Galicia, demand of Poland that she immediately evacuate East Galicia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution of the Lorain County Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Elyria, Ohio, favoring the reduction of armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented resolutions of the Optimist Club of Columbus and the Chamber of Commerce of Toledo, both in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

## FEDERAL LIVE-STOCK COMMISSION.

Mr. NORRIS. By direction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably with several amendments the bill (S. 659) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 39) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.